English Protestants and resistance writings 1553-1603.

Bowler, Gerald

ENGLISH PROTESTANTS
AND RESISTANCE WRITINGS
1553-1603

Gerald Bowler

Submitted for the Ph.D. degree

King's College

University of London

1981

Abstract

Resistance theory is that body of thought which accepts the justifiability of violent withstanding of the superior power. This thesis deals with these theories when they appear in printed form either written by English Protestants or published for an English Protestant readership, particularly in the years 1553 to 1603.

Chapter I shows that while no Englishman in the early sixteenth century had produced a work advocating the overthrow of a Tudor king, resistance theory circulated through imported works and was also present in embryonic form. Though the cult of authority predominated, it is shown how the conditional nature of obedience and the tension between the Edwardian clergy and nobility led to an easier acceptance of resistance theory by Protestants under Queen Mary.

The relationship between resistance writings and the mainstream of the works produced by the Marian exiles is shown to be a close one in Chapter II. As well it is seen that these resistance tracts were produced by men at the centre of exile life.

In Chapter III the wide range of concerns expressed in Marian resistance literature is demonstrated. Constitutional, economic, political and judicial, as well as religious grievances, are seen to be at the root of these writings. This secular element as well as the appeal to the common people to act against tyranny is shown to radically distinguish English resistance theories from those produced by Continental Protestants.

That these theories continued to be published for an English Protestant readership under Queen Elizabeth is shown in Chapter IV, though it is demonstrated that these theories were seldom directed at the Queen. Concern for the defence of foreign Protestant movements is seen as the mainspring of many of these works. A brief Conclusion points to areas in which future research might be directed to assess the ways in which foreign and English Catholic, foreign Protestant, and Stuart resistance theory assimilated the resistance writings of English Protestants.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents (Continued)

Acknowledgements

The research and preparation involved in the production of a dissertation naturally incurs debts. I am indebted to the Librarians and staff of the Institute of Historical Research, the British Library, Senate House Library, University of London, Sion College, the Bodleian, Cambridge University Library, Doctor Williams's Library, the Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, Lambeth Palace Library, the London Society of Antiquaries, and the University of Saskatchewan.

I am obliged to the authors of the dissertations cited for permission to use their works and I am particularly grateful to the Bibliographic Society for the access they granted me to their typescript of the A-H section of the new Short-Title Catalogue.

For advice and encouragement, I am very grateful to my supervisor, Prof. H.G. Koenigsberger of King's College, London. The members of the early modern English seminar at the Institute of Historical Research, and particularly Prof. Conrad Russell and Dr. Peter Lake, were unfailingly helpful on my behalf as were colleagues and friends from the Tudor and Stuart Society, London.

Financial support for this research was made available through the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Above all, my thanks are due to my wife, Karen Jensen, for her many contributions to this work.

CHAPTER I: CONCEPTS OF TYRANNY TO 1553

In 1536 and twice again in 1549 England was the scene of a major rebellion.[1] The north of the country rose in the 1536 Pilgrimage of Grace and put 30,000 men, many of them seasoned veterans of border skirmishes with the Scots, into the field. For two months they dominated a large section of England and no royal army dared attack them. In 1549 Cornwall and Devon rose and sent an army marching on London. Their defeat cost the westcountry men 4,000 lives. That same year rebels in Norfolk seized Norwich, the second largest city in England, and suffered 3,000 casualties in battles with a royal army strengthened by foreign mercenaries. Despite the significant size of these disturbances and the threat they were able to pose to the central government it is interesting that none of the rebellions produced any theory of resistance, that is, any doctrine that would have justified active opposition to the sovereign. Rebel demands were issued, stirring ballads were sung, but nowhere was there an attempt to argue the case for the legitimacy of resistance. This is because few, if any, of the participants felt themselves to be in revolt against the King and because each rising was conducted in a framework of legality. The risings were conducted as demonstrations of discontent rather than attempts to overthrow a government. The commons demanded, and received, direction from community leaders such as J.P.s, large landowners or priests, and felt themselves throughout the proceedings to be loyal subjects of the King.[2] One leader of the Pilgrimage of Grace,

Thomas Lord Darcy, told Hugh Latimer who had come to the Tower to confer with the captured rebel:

> And I had seen my sovereign lord in the field...and I had seen his grace come against us, I would have lighted from my horse, and taken my sword by the point, and yielded it into his grace's hands.[3]

It was some weeks after the start of the Pilgrimage before its leader Robert Aske thought to inquire of his supporting clergy "whether it were lawful to a subject to make war against his prince in defence of the faith". The clergy seemed reluctant to give their approval to such a bold proposition and Aske himself maintained "that by no just law no man might rebel against their sovereign lord and king."[4] The men of the Western Rising included in their list of demands the article: "Item, we pray God save king Edward, for we be hys, both body and soul".[5] The Norfolk rebels were confident that they were merely enacting central government economic policy against local opposition and even issued proclamations in the capacity of royal agents.[6] Clearly the framework in which these risings attempted to conduct themselves offered little scope for the development of a mature theory of resistance to the sovereign power.

Such a theory emerged only after 1553 and continued developing throughout the century. To understand the forms it took it is necessary to outline the question of obedience and resistance in Tudor England before the accession of Mary I and examine possible sources of resistance theory available to Englishmen at that time.

The Call to Obedience

William Tyndale's 1528 Obedience of a Christian Man set out the first comprehensive statement of the problem

by an English Protestant.[7] A partial aim of his book was to disassociate adherents of the reformed religion from damaging accusations of political excesses. Writing scarcely three years after the tragedies of the German Peasant War, Tyndale noted that critics had said of Protestantism "that it causeth insurrection and teacheth the people to disobey their heads and governors, and moveth them to rise against their princes, and to make all common, and to make havock of other men's goods."[8] By his handling of the subject of true and godly obedience Tyndale hoped to refute these charges. Basing his political observations firmly on the Pauline injunction of Romans 13 ("Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God...Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God."), Tyndale made obedience a religious act. The faithful Christian, (lay or cleric, for Tyndale was anxious to deny claims by the clergy for exemption), would render obedience to his prince as a man beyond human accountability. The ruler, Christian or heathen, was "in this world without law; and may at his lust do right or wrong."[9] Lest it be thought that oppression might release a subject from the duty of obedience Tyndale made it clear that tyrants ruled by divine ordination as surely as the wisest and most clement king. Evil rulers were the tools of an angry God used to chastise a nation for its sins and bring it to repentance and an amended life. Once this had been accomplished and the nation, kissing the rod, had accepted its chastisement, God, who held tyrants in his hand, would either remove the tyrant or change his heart for the

better. Against such a divine agent rebellion was not only sinful but also ill-advised in practical ways. A tyrant was infinitely preferable, as a ruler, to a weak and passive king who might be unable to maintain civil order. Moreover any attempt at resistance would only prompt worse oppression from the aroused tyrant or a new, and perhaps foreign, usurper. Tyndale's political quietism is stated eloquently when he observes:

> A christian man, in respect of God, is but a passive thing; a thing that suffereth only and doth nought; as the sick in respect of the surgeon or physician doth but suffer only.

A marginal note on this page also reads: "Evil rulers are wholesome medicines."[10]

Though Tyndale died at the stake, still calling on God to open the King of England's eyes, his political thought gained currency in England, especially in official circles. In 1535, the year before Tyndale suffered as a martyr, Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, published De Vera Obedentia, a defence of the Henrician Supremacy and an attack on papal pretensions.[11] In this work Gardiner echoes Tyndale's call for submission and obedience to "the image of God upon earth". Some might say, speculated Gardiner, that the principle of obeying the prince was never in doubt. It was rather a matter of those limits appointed the King and beyond which he must notpass. Gardiner, however, dismissed this approach:

> What maner of limites ar those that ye tel me of, seing the scripture hath non such? but generallie speaking of obedience, which the subject is bound to do unto the prince, the wife unto the husband, or the servant to the master, it hath not added so much as one sillable of excepcion, but onli hath preserved the obedience due unto God safe and hole, that we shoulde not harken unto ani mans worde in al the world against God. 12

The risings of 1536 and 1549 prompted the Henrician and Edwardian governments to produce an "official" stand on the question of obedience. Thomas Cromwell employed the talents of humanist scholars like Richard Morison and Thomas Starkey in answering the claims of the Pilgrimage of Grace[13] while, under Edward, the homily "An Exhortation Concerning Good Order and Obedience" served a similar purpose.[14] In these works the arguments from Scripture were, of course, repeated and embroidered. Obedience was due to rulers because they were agents of God who ruled through kings, good or evil. The fifth Commandment, "Honour thy father", was cited and the term "father" held to include ministers and governors. The people owed the princes not only honour and obedience, but "they must also love them, as children do their fathers, yea they must more tendre the suertie of theyr princes person, and his astate than their owne".[15] The punishments meted out to Biblical rebels such as Korah, Dathan and Absalom were used as evidence of eternal divine displeasure toward seditious subjects. Though no one would venture as far as Tyndale had and assert that the king was above the law, there was emphasis on the uniqueness of the royal person as defined by scripture. Kings were the Lord's annointed and sometimes called "gods"(Psalm 82:6). As such they were accorded special protection from plotters and assassins. "God plucketh wyt and prudency from malyciouse traytours", said Richard Morison who maintained that even against tyrants treason seldom prospered.[16] Using a scriptural passage that was to be cited frequently under Elizabeth, the "Exhortation Concerning Good Order and

Obedience" claimed that the very birds of the air would disclose treason against a king.[17] Such was the special status of the royal person that David, who might lawfully have killed King Saul in self-defence, was said to have held back, knowing "he might in no wise withstand, hurt or kill his sovereign Lord and King".[18]

These government writers also pursued the cause of obedience beyond the bounds of Scripture. A powerful argument they employed was the claim that disobedient subjects violated cosmic order by their seditious acts. This order, divinely ordained, set everything in its proper place. Human society too reflected this scheme of things as every man had his vocation, with each man in need of the other. This was not a democratic order, however, as the positions of nobles and kings were of much greater importance than those of the inferior sort. Remove these men and the result would be chaos, for the people were unfit to govern themselves. "It farre passeth Coblers crafte to discusse, what lordes, what byshops, what counsaylours, what actes statutes and lawes are mooste mete for a common welthe" was the opinion of Morison in his Lamentation.[19] Had not history shown the dire consequences of popular rule? It was the fickle mob that had condemned Socrates to death and Scipio to exile.[20] It was plain that if order, peace and good government were to hold sway the rule must be borne by those most fit and the rest obey as the divine order dictated. As Cranmer wrote to the Devon rebels of 1549:

Standeth it with any reason to turn upside down the

> good order of the whole world, that is everywhere, and ever hath been, that is to say, the commoners to be governed by the nobles, and the servants by their masters? Will you now have the subjects to govern their king, the villains to rule the gentlemen, and the servants their masters? If men would suffer this God will not. [21]

"Chese is no medicine to drive awaye rattes: neyther sedytion a meane to make men welthy."[22] The disastrous economic and social consequences of disobedience were another weapon in the armoury of government apologists. The horror of the battlefield was evoked to recall the seditious to loyalty:

> He that setteth the blody feld before his eies, here legges, there heedes, these deadly wounded, those utterly deed, is it possible, that any man can so cast of humanitie, so hate men, that he had leaver have so many deed...than to have them alive and his frendes? [23]

Sir John Cheke in his 1549 The hurt of sedicion saw famine, inflation and depopulation of the land as the natural consequences of rebellion. In addition the commons would range king and nobility against them, losing the benefit of planned reforms and arousing the arbitrary terror of martial law. As it was assumed that rebels would always fail, who would prosper from disobedience? It would be foreign and internal enemies of England, the French, the Scots and the papists who would benefit from rebellion and the resulting economic and military weaknesses.[24] Not only would England lose face but true religion itself would suffer as the gospel would wrongly be blamed for "disobedience, sedition and carnal liberality, and the destruction of those policies, kingdoms and commonweals, where it is received."[25]

These works in defence of the government's proceedings were quick to deny any validity in the rebel demands for redress of grievances. Those Catholic subjects in arms

for their religion were told that the destruction of the monasteries and the banishing of the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome were acts of wisdom solemnly undertaken for the good of the nation by the whole Parliament.[26] Economic complaints were discounted as a possible excuse for rebellion -- Christ himself had been poor. Poverty was a God-given estate, ordained that God could show his might by raising some of the lowly to wealth and by reducing some of the rich to poverty.[27] The real causes of disobedience were said to lie elsewhere. Morison ascribed the problem to idleness, disunity in religion and minds indisposed to order.[28] This latter, psychological, approach was very popular in these tracts. The homily on obedience called rebellion an intolerable ignorance and madness while Cheke referred to the "witchcraft" of sedition. Morison saw the roots of disobedience not in economic or religious grievance but in "some other wylde worme, that wolde not suffer madde braynes to be at reste". William Kethe, who became an ardent proponent of resistance under Mary, saw the problem differently under Edward and likened rebels to "beastes brutalle". Thomas Becon referred to the "brainsick, yea, rather the brainless head" which attempts to reform the commonwealth.[29]

There were those, however, who were prepared to see in the grievances of the peasantry genuine cause for complaint. Distressed by the impact of what they perceived to be a new spirit of acquisitiveness, these writers and preachers protested against economic oppression. Henry Brinklow's Complaynt of Roderyck Mors spoke out against enclosures and greedy clergy under

Henry, a protest that was continued by Robert Crowley's Peticion agaynst the oppressours and The way to wealth under Edward.[30] Joining in the debate were clergymen like Hugh Latimer, John Hooper, Thomas Lever, Thomas Becon, John Ponet and John Bradford.[31]

Said Hooper:

> The ryche man so incrochith, gathereth together, and obteneyneth so muche into hys owne handes, that he alone possesseth the earth lyveth therebye, and hys poore neyghboure readye too dye for lacke, so that he is brought into Tantalus paine, meat and drinke catel and corne inough of every syde of hym, yet shall rather dye for lacke then the unsatiable and never contented, covetouse persons wyll price theyr goodes so as poore men, theyr wives and theyr Chyldren maye be hable to by resonable peniworthes of Goddes aboundaunte plentye that he bringeth out of the earth.[32]

This state of affairs, naturally enough, provokes rebellion against those whom Crowley characterized as cormorants and greedy gulls.[33] Landowners were urged to consider the poor and remember that the Christian attitude to commerce emphasized stewardship rather than exploitation.[34]

All these writers, however much they resented the oppressive actions that prompted rebellion, continued to deny the legitimacy of violent resistance. Hooper boldly stated "no trayterouse or sedityous man can be saved but obediente and quiet men shall inherit the kingdom of heaven", and he advised the people to seek redress not in rebellion but at the hands of the king and his officials.[35] Lever reminded his listeners (which that day included Edward and the Council) that Christian subjects were to respond to economic exactions in this spirit: "thou art commaunded if he

contend to take thy cloke to give hym also thy cote. Whatsoever is asked, rather, gyve more."[36]

Included among these writings and sermons are two elements important for the development of the resistance theory of the Marian exile. The first has been noted before, that obedience was not to be given in those instances where it would offend God and the true religion. Thomas Starkey claimed the Word must take priority in determining obedience and that anything contrary to it "must be utterly abrogate and boldily disobeyed with all constancy. For suche barbarous tyranny may not be suffred in christen civilitie."[37] Hooper echoed this sentiment but added that obedience was also never to be given contrary to "the lawe of nature".[38] The homily on obedience cited the Book of Acts and urged Christians commanded to act against God to say with the Apostles "We must rather obey God than man."[39]

A second element to be noted is a dislike and mistrust of the nobility that is evident in some of the Edwardian divines. This stemmed partly, as we have seen, from their perception of economic oppression, and partly from a disenchantment with the religious hypocrisy they sensed in the nobility. John Knox complained in 1552 that "the most godly princes had officers and chief councillors most ungodly, conjured enemies to God's true religion" and compared Northumberland and his supporters to Ahitophel, Judas and Shebna.[40] Ridley, from his Marian prison, lamented that neither the aggressive tactics of Knox, Latimer,

Bradford and Lever, nor the gentler methods of other divines had been able to convince the Edwardian magnates to hear the poor or the word of God -- "they were never persuaded in their hearts, but from the teeth forward."[41] These sentiments led many preachers to predict a swift and horrible intervention by God. Ponet, in a sermon before the King and Council, preached against those whose unamended life offended the Lord and condemned especially those of the rich who when "they be cryed out vpon for their extorsion and oppression of the poore, they contynewe in their extorsion and oppression styll." He prayed that the divine correction that was imminent would be administered in mercy and not in fury.[42] Crowley warned the economic oppressors of a divine justice waiting in the wings, and Lever prophesied that soon God would either take a terrible and righteous vengeance on England or work some miraculous mercy.[43]

Both the claim that obedience is not to be given contrary to the word of God and the sense of noble distrust become evident in the writings of the Marian exiles, many of whom were among these defenders of the cause of obedience.

Starkey and Pole

It must not be supposed that this "cult of authority" went unopposed or that the image of a tyrant as the unchallengeable agent of God was the only one extant in mid-Tudor England. Two books intended for the eyes of Henry VIII himself present an altogether different picture.

Between 1532 and the summer of 1536, in Italy and in England, Thomas Starkey wrote a work now known as A Dialogue Between Reginald Pole and Thomas Lupset.[44] Starkey had once been a part of Pole's Paduan household and, on his return to England to take employment in Cromwell's service, he tried to win Pole over to the King's side. Though his failure to do so did not lose him Cromwell's favour it did render abortive the plan to present Henry with a copy of the Dialogue. The King would not have been inclined to look with favour on a work which presented his arch-enemy as the physician with the remedy for many of the nation's ills.[45]

Starkey's Dialogue begins with Thomas Lupset, a noted humanist scholar and member of Pole's circle in Padua until his death in 1530, urging Pole to rouse himself and come to the aid of his country, instead of drowning himself in the pleasure of letters and private studies. In the course of their conversation on the civil life the two touch on many of England's problems and Pole offers a variety of solutions including a codification of the nation's laws, a comprehensive Poor Law, and novel constitutional changes.

These latter changes must interest us as they are said to be necessary to prevent the rule of tyrants, "the ground of all ill, the well of all mischief and misorder, the root of all sedition and ruin of all civility."[46] To Starkey tyranny was not the result of God's anger but the consequence of a nation's failure to follow right reason and order.[47] The remedy for the threat of tyranny was the abandonment of the practice

of passing the crown from father to son and its replacement with an elective monarchy. A ruler in such a system would be bound by his own laws and by a small council, representing Parliament's authority, which would ensure there would be no lapse into tyranny. Moreover a ruler who had proved himself a tyrant would be subject to deposition and replacement. Starkey pointed to the ancient office of Constable of England as one that was originally intended to restrain tyranny and proposed that the position, now repressed, be revived and the power to temper the rule of the prince given to the small Council.[48]

Though Starkey's Dialogue was never presented to the King and remained in manuscript it appears to have been read and discussed, at least by the collection of writers in Cromwell's employ.[49] As this circle included the future Marian refugee Sir Richard Morison it would not be too surprising to see Starkey's influence in some of the political ideas of the exile.

It is ironical that the book which doomed Starkey's manuscript to oblivion itself made a contribution to the question of obedience and resistance. That book was Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church written as his statement on Henry VIII's divorce and assumption of the supremacy of the Church of England.[50] Henry had long desired Pole's favourable opinion on these matters but Pole had been extremely reluctant to commit himself against the King and had escaped to his studies in Italy to avoid doing so. Finally, prompted by the executions of Cardinal Fisher and Sir Thomas

More, Pole began to write and attacked in his work two recent defences of the Supremacy by Stephen Gardiner and Richard Sampson. One of Pole's biographers called the Defence of the Unity of the Church "monstrously long, liberally sprinkled with irrelevant matter, and very repetitive" with a tone that was "invariably didactic and at times downright pedantic".[51] Despite this the work is informed by a sorrowful passion that at times makes compelling reading; Pole himself likened the work to the cry of a grieving mother calling on her dead child.[52]

It was natural for Pole in his attack on the Henrician Supremacy to touch on the question of obedience and resistance. Pole admitted that kings, even non-Christians, were to be obeyed and went further to say that God had bestowed super-natural powers and strengths to good rulers to enable them to carry out their duties. But obedience had its just and proper limits and must not be given contrary to the law of God.[53] As for the passage in I Peter 2, "Honor the King", upon which Bishop Sampson had built so much, Pole put it in perspective by noting that the Bible also commands honor to be given to old people, physicians, and parents. Pole then asked "to what great extent would not the honor due your father surpass all royal honors if your father happened to be an elderly physician?"[54] Kings were ordained to protect the people and he cited the maxim "propter populum igitur Rex, non populus propter regem". Kings who seek only their own good lose the very title of King and are, in fact,

tyrants.[55] Pole's portrait of Henry is certainly one of a tyrant. He had usurped priestly powers and ordered priests murdered. In these acts he resembled those Biblical kings who came to bad ends, Ozias and Saul. His marital affairs were scandalous and his attempt to disinherit his daughter Mary could only indicate a desire to dispose of all the nation's nobility. Henry's taxation was oppressive; he had been led by evil councillors to believe that all was the King's.

In response to this tyranny, Pole did not actually advocate resistance to Henry VIII. (It must be remembered that the Defence was written as a private letter to the King.) What Pole did do was, in an imaginary conversation with the Emperor, cite English precedents of resistance and indicate a high level of popular support for an invasion in support of Queen Catherine and Princess Mary. If, said Pole, the Emperor were to prepare an expedition against Constantinople he would ask him to turn against those "new Turks" of England. Should the Emperor consent he would be aided by "those legions of men whose knees have not bowed before Baal". These were men of the same nation

> who, on behalf of more trifling cause, with no outside help, imposed punishments for kings who had badly administered the government. These Englishmen compelled their kings to render an account of the money that had poured out profusely to the great loss of the realm. When the people did not approve these accounts, they compelled their kings to renounce their crown and scepter.[56]

The Chronicles

Though Pole cited English history as precedent for successful resistance to the sovereign, many of his contemporaries claimed that History provided overwhelming evidence for the futility and wickedness of rebellion. At his trial in 1554 Thomas Wyatt, making the captured rebel's conventional speech of confession, admitted his guilt and claimed that reading the chronicles would show that "never Rebellion against their natural prince and country, from the beginning, prospered."[57] In an age that read its history books for their didactic lessons in morality and providence the editor's introduction to Carion's The thre bokes of Cronicles was uttering a commonplace in asserting that history provided a stern warning to private citizens that their magistrates must always be obeyed.[58] Mid-Tudor history books certainly provided numerous examples of unsuccessful rebellions. In addition to dozens of Biblical and classical instances the more recent examples of Cade's Rebellion in England or the 1525 uprising of the German peasants who were "slaine lyke beastes, by the just judgement of god"[59] provided clear admonitions to all would-be rebels.

However, despite the earnest intentions of the editors and authors, the advisability of unqualified obedience was not, as Pole had shown, the only lesson that could be drawn from a reading of history. These books presented a view of the tyrant at odds with that

of the semi-official literature of obedience. They also presented the stories of a wide variety of successful coups, depositions, and rebellions showing that tyrants were often justly removed by mortal hand. In fact Henrician and Edwardian history books could provide ample inspiration or justification for a proponent of resistance. Readers interested in recent European history could learn, for example, of the events which expelled King Christian of Denmark from his throne or of the deposition of the Emperor Wenceslas "for cowardice and unhonest lyfe".[60] The results of the Conciliar claim to unseat popes could be seen in the accounts of the depositions of popes.[61] Classical history could be seen to show the evil end of oppressors such as Domitian or Clearchus by whose assassination "men may the ryghtful guerdon se,/ Of tyrauntes, whiche by their violence,/ Toppresse the people have no conscience".[62] The Biblical tale of Queen Athaliah, slain by the supporters of the lawful inheritor, showed the wide-spread belief in the justifiability of resistance to a usurper:

> Lo here the ende, of murder and tyrannye
> Lo here the ende, of usurpacyon,
> Lo here the ende, of false conspiracy
> Lo here the ende, of false presumpcion
> Borne rightful heyres, wrongly to put them doun
> O noble princes, tho god make you stronge
> To rightful heirs, beware ye do no wronge.[63]

It is English history, however, which provided the reader of mid-Tudor histories with the clearest portraits of tyranny and often successful resistance. The best examples of domestic tyrants are William the Conqueror, Edward II, Richard II and Richard III, the

latter three all deposed and slain. Of William it was said that, as a usurper, he ruled with great cruelty, burdened the populace with severe taxes and "ordeined newe lawes at his owne pleasure, profitable to hym selfe, but grevous and hurtfull to the people".[64] He was also accused of keeping the native population from bearing any office or honor.[65] Another usurper was Richard III whose deposition in 1485 had led to the founding of the Tudor dynasty and whose reign was said to be so black that even the bad weather was blamed on the king.[66] He was held to be a lecher and a murderer, a man of deceit and oppression. His end was held by all to be a shining example of the fate of sinners and one meant to deter others from following a similar path.[67]

Of the justification for the deposition of a tyrant mid-Tudor readers could learn most from the stories of Edward II and Richard II. Edward was said to have been "unstedfast of maners, and disposed too lyghtnes", given to drunkenness and the pleasures of the flesh.[68] He scorned the company of the nation's nobility and instead befriended "vilaynes and vile persones".[69] His deposition is represented more as a result of his inadequacy as a ruler than as a reaction to any cruel oppression. It was said that he "wolde not governe and rule his people nor his realme as a kynge sholde do"[70] and, in the gratification of his appetites he neglected "ordering his common weale by sadnesse, discrecion and Justice".[71] His deposition in 1327 came at the hands of his nobility who sent a

representative to the imprisoned king to announce:

> I, William Trussell, in the name of all men in this lande of Englande, and procuratoure of thys parlyament, resygne to the Edwarde, the homage that was made to the somtyme, and from thys tyme forth, depryve the of all kynglye power. And I shall never be attendaunt unto the as kynge after thys tyme.[72]

In 1399 another king, Richard II, found himself in a similar position. Imprisoned after a rising of his nobility he was visited by a delegation who urged him to step down. To this Richard agreed and read an instrument of deposition in which he acknowledged himself "to be and have bene unsuffycyente and unable, and also unprofytable, and for myne open desertes not unworthy to be put downe."[73] This was declared acceptable by Parliament which pronounced him deposed. It was also decided that a list of Richard's manifold crimes be punished "to the extent that the commons should be perswaded that he was an unjust and unprofitable Prince and a tyraunte over his subjectes and worthy to be deposed."[74] These articles provide a catalogue of the acts of a tyrant. They include the murder and persecution of certain nobles and prelates, notably the Duke of Lancaster and the Archbishop of Canterbury, by royal order. Richard was said to have perverted justice by threatening witnesses, and, contrary to Magna Carta, by having young men martially challenge old men. He replaced lawful officers and members of Parliament with his own minions and otherwise interfered with Parliament by breaching promises to it. He let his soldiers rob and pillage with impunity. His economic misdeeds included taxing at

will, wasting the treasure on unworthy men and failing to repay loans. Moreover he tyrannously claimed that all his subjects' goods were his. Richard was said to be in violation of his coronation oath, as well as law and custom, by his extortion of the clergy. His attitude to kingship was summed up in the accusation that he claimed that the law was in his head or breast, "by reason of whiche fantasticall opinion, he destroied men and empoverished the pore commons."[75]

The portrait of the tyrant that these histories outlined to their mid-Tudor readers is an interesting one. A ruler might qualify himself for the title by either usurping the throne or by oppression after lawful succession. Oppression was seen to consist of a variety of crimes but unjust taxation and ruling without the law headed the list. Other misdeeds included oath-breaking, murder and debauchery. Significantly, no criticisms are levied against those who resisted tyrants and responsibility for their overthrow is seldom attributed to the hand of Providence.[76] Historical precedent then might well appeal to those faced with the problem of justifying resistance to a Tudor monarch.

The Reformation and Resistance

The idea that, under certain circumstances, resistance might legitimately be offered to the higher powers was one that was shared by the major Protestant reformers on the Continent. The first to take such a stand was Huldreich Zwingli at Zurich in January 1523.

Among the sixty-seven articles he offered to publicly defend were several on the relationship between the Christian and the civil power. Zwingli maintained that all Christians, without exception, owed obedience to the civil authority.[77] This obedience, however, was a conditional one and depended on the prince's laws being in harmony with the divine will. Should he prove unfaithful and transgress the laws of Christ, Zwingli claimed in the forty-second of his articles that the ruler may be deposed in the name of God.[78] In his Auslegen und Gründe der Schlussreden, a lengthy defence of these articles published later in 1523, Zwingli discussed who was to be responsible for such a godly deposition. If a tyrant had superiors, appeal should be made to them for the deposition.[79] However, in the case of a tyrant inheriting the throne and ruling according to his will only the people as a whole were responsible. No individual should act against the ruler, for that would lead to tumult, but a deposition by the greater, more pious, part of the people was acceptable in the eyes of God. When a nation shirked its responsibility, as Israel did under the idolatrous Manasseh, it invited the divine punishment due its ruler onto itself as well. Zwingli noted that there lacked neither ideas nor methods on the deposition of evil rulers; only sufficient piety was missing.[80]

This avowal of the right of resistance was not widely shared by leading Protestant clergymen during the 1520's. However the threats to Protestantism

that had become more imminent after the Augsburg Diet seem to have drawn reformers toward a different attitude. This was particularly evident in the case of Martin Luther whose pronouncements on the question before 1530 had all clearly emphasized the duties of obedience. The change in his position began with his support of the Torgau Declaration in October 1530 and continued with the publication, in the next year, of Luther's Warning to his Dear German People.[82] In this work Luther, speaking to Catholics and supporters of the Emperor, announced that he would not oppose resistance in the defence of Protestantism nor would he allow this violence to be termed rebellion. Though he claimed not to be urging this resistance, Luther, in his Warning, sanctioned it on the grounds of a legitimate self-defence by "those who are enjoined and authorized to do so", a reference to the Protestant princes.[83]

Throughout the 1530's, Lutheran resistance theory grew bolder and more sophisticated. The reluctant acceptance of the right of self-defence became firmer in Philip Melanchthon's handling of the question. In an edition of the Warning published during the Schmalkaldic War a preface by Melanchthon approvingly cited classical examples of tyrannicide in cases of self-defence.[84]

A different approach to the justification of resistance eminently suited to the German situation, was that advancing the rights of the "inferior magistracy". In this constitutional argument it was generally

claimed that certain officials in each nation possessed the right and duty to defend the people from oppression. Melanchthon noted that the Spartans had their ephors, the French their Parlements and the Germans their Electors.[85]

This constitutional argument had been advanced in 1530 by a man destined to play a part in the English Reformation. Martin Bucer, in an edition of the commentary on St. Matthew in his In Sacra Quattuor Evangelica Enarrationes, maintained that inferior magistrates, a term which he held to include civic governments, were duty-bound to defend the true religion of their subjects from the oppression of tyrants.[86] Bucer viewed these officials as a bulwark against absolutism and went on to advocate, from a religious view-point, an elective monarchy.[87]

The work which was to have most success in spreading this doctrine of resistance by the inferior magistracy was not first published until 1536. The Institutes of the Christian Religion by Jean Calvin dealt with civil government in the twentieth chapter of its final book. Like Luther before him Calvin defended government against those, such as Anabaptists, who felt that true Christians had no need of such compulsion. Civil authority was, in fact, a holy calling and one that could legitimately command the deference, obedience, and tribute of the Christian.[88] This obedience is enjoined for the sake of men's conscience as Paul made clear in Romans 13, Titus 3,

and I Peter 2 and applied not only to the good prince but to murderous tyrants as well. Evil rulers were to be considered as God's agents for the punishment of the people's wickedness. When subjects are abused, despoiled or persecuted they should remember their own misdeeds and find their remedy in prayer. Though they are to disobey ungodly commands, Calvin forbids private individuals from more actively resisting tyranny. He does however allow certain officials to act, if need arise, against their superiors. If, he said, there are "magistrates of the people, appointed to restrain the willfullness of kings" such as the ephors, tribunes and demarchs of ancient times or the Estates that now exercised such power, they neglected their duty if they did not protect the people from unjust oppression.[89] In addition to this appeal to constitutional powers Calvin, in editions of the Institutes after 1539, noted that God would often raise up mortals to carry out the punishment of kings. These avengers, called and armed from heaven, would deliver the oppressed people and remove tyrants.[90]

This idea of a divinely-inspired tyrannicide appeared as well in the writings of the Zürich reformer, Heinrich Bullinger. In 1549 he published the first two of his decades of sermons and in several of them he dealt with civil government. The magistrate was an agent of God to be obeyed no matter his personal demerits, "so long as justice is maintained, and good lawes and publique peace defended."

Prayer is to be seen as the remedy for tyranny but Bullinger also noted that God could destroy tyrants by raising up avengers.

> Sometimes hee stirreth up noble capitaines and valiaunt men to displace tyraunts, and set Gods people at libertie: as wee see many examples thereof in the bookes of Judges and Kings. [91]

That Bullinger took these examples seriously in the context of the European Reformation can be seen from the warning he adds.

> But least any man doe fall to abuse those examples, let him consider their calling by God. Which calling if hee have not or else do prevent, hee is so farre from doing good in killing the tyraunt, that it is to be feared, least he doe make the evil double as much as it was before.[92]

Two more works by Protestant clergymen advocating resistance must be noted. The first is the 1547 Rémonstances aux fidèles by the French divine Pierre Viret. In it he emphasized the duty of the inferior magistracy to protect the people from a persecuting tyrant bent on establishing idolatry.[93] The second is the Magdeburg Bekenntnis, one of many tracts published by the inhabitants of the city of Magdeburg in defence of their refusal to accept the Interim.[94] The Bekenntnis claimed that the inferior magistrate was duty bound by the laws of God, nature and true religion to protect the people from the actions of an oppressive superior.[95] As the forces of the Emperor were persecuting the true religion it was therefore lawful for Magdeburg to resist them.

It must now be asked whether any of these writings could have had any effect on the ideas of a disaffected Englishman in the reign of Mary I. The chances seem

rather great that in some cases they could.

Contacts between the English and Continental reformations were many and the opportunities to become acquainted with resistance theory were great. Several divines, who were to become Marian exiles, had spent an earlier enforced sojourn with European Protestants during the reign of Henry VIII. Miles Coverdale, for example, had been for a time a Lutheran pastor and had translated some of Luther's works. Other Marian exile writers who had spent considerable time on the Continent included Bartholomew Traheron, William Turner, and John Bale.[96] Under Edward VI Archbishop Cranmer made a conscious attempt to influence the course of the English reformation by contacts with foreign reformers.[97] To England came such preachers and writers as Bernard Ochino, John a Lasco, Peter Martyr, Paul Fagius and one whom we have seen to have been an advocate of resistance, Martin Bucer. Jean Calvin corresponded with Edward VI and Protector Somerset and his thought exercised no little influence.[98]

As to the writings themselves, Bucer's In Sacra Quattour Evangelica Ennarationes most certainly reached at least a few English readers. A 1536 edition of the work was dedicated by Bucer to the Henrician bishop of Hereford, Edward Foxe, who had visited Strasbourg as ambassador to the Protestant German princes.[99] Bullinger's Decades were dedicated, in part, to Edward VI and to Lord Grey. Zwingli's Der Hirt was translated and published in 1550 as The ymage of both pastours.[100] Here we find an explanation of the right to resistance

of the inferior magistracy:

> For as among the Lacedemonians there were certayne offycers called Ephori, and among the Romaynes, other whom they called Tribuni, and at thys presente, in certayne cytyes of Germany, there be hygh wardens of companyes or trybes, whyche do resyste and wythstande the heade ruler, yf at any tyme, through over great power he waxeth out of facion, so god did institute and ordaine pastours among hys people, as certayne offycers whych shulde alwayes watche.[101]

In this work Zwingli also noted the legitimacy of assassination by those with "a speciall commandement of God".[102] The story of Magdeburg's resistance to the Emperor for religious reasons was well known to the Council[103] and Roger Ascham, tutor of Edward VI and Elizabeth I, serving with the English embassy to Charles V, sent Sir John Cheke in 1550 a copy of the Bekenntnis.[104] Luther's Warnung received no Edwardian translation but the speed with which it was taken up on Mary's accession may suggest a prior acquaintance by some English readers.[105] A German account of Luther's funeral was translated into English by John Bale during Henry's reign and to this Bale appended his version of a prayer by the Elector of Saxony justifying resistance for the sake of religion.[106]

Though the resistance writings of other reformers found no English publishers before the reign of Elizabeth, they nonetheless may have been imported into England in their original languages. Certainly Calvin's Institutes found its way into Edwardian Oxford where Christopher Goodman is known to have had a copy.[107] In any event it seems highly probable that by 1554 Englishmen, searching for the means to justify their opposition to the Marian regime, would

have become aware that continental Protestantism included, in its canons, writings sanctioning the right to resist.

The European Tradition

Another source of English resistance theory which must be investigated is the tradition of opposition to tyrants that was found in European literature from classical times through to the sixteenth century and which most often took the form of the approval of tyrannicide.[108]

The Greeks, to whom tyranny was the rule of one man for his own selfish ends, were wont to reward the murderers of tyrants as Aristotle and Xenophon noted.[109] The latter, in a dialogue on the nature of tyrannical rule, said:

> For instead of avenging them, the cities greatly honor the one who kills the tyrant; and instead of excluding the killer from sacred rites, as they do the murderers of private men, the cities erect in their temples statues of those who have committed such an act.[110]

Cicero shows the persistence of this tradition when in De Officiis he remarked that the Roman people viewed the killing of tyrants, not as murder, but as the noblest of acts. Tyrants were like diseased limbs which, in order to safeguard the body, must be cut off.[111] To Seneca was attributed the maxim "nulla fere sit Deo acceptior hostia tyranni sanguine"[112] and the philosopher himself was involved in a conspiracy on the life of Nero. Roman law allowed for legitimate killing in cases of self-defence and notorious injury.[113]

Tyrannicide also found support in the Middle Ages, notably in the writings of John of Salisbury, secretary to Thomas Becket. His Policraticus recommended tyrannicide as a fitting remedy for the rule of tyrants, both those who warrant the term by unjust usurpation and those legitimate successors who rule oppressively.[114] John, however, ruled out the use of poison against a tyrant and forbade killing by those bound by oath to the ruler.[115]

In various writings St. Thomas Aquinas also addressed himself to the problem of resistance to tyrants. In his Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard he noted the opinion of Cicero in De Oficiis and concluded that in cases of usurpation by violence, with no possibility of appeal to a higher authority, "one who liberates his country by killing a tyrant is to be praised and rewarded."[116] Aquinas seems to treat the subject more cautiously in his De Regimine Principum, written for the King of Cyprus. Tyranny was to be tolerated, if it were not excessive, as an unsuccessful action might prompt further outrages by the tyrant, and even a successful attempt might breed faction or a worse ruler.[117] The example of Old Testament tyrannicide is countered by New Testament injunctions on obedience and subjects are urged to take their grievances to a tyrant's superior or to God. However active resistance may be taken by public authority:

> if to provide itself with a king belong to the right of any multitude, it is not unjust that the king set by that multitude be destroyed or his power restricted, if he tyrannically abuse the royal power.[118]

By not fulfilling his office the tyrant warrants his fate as the fate of the Tarquin kings, driven from Rome, shows. In Secunda Secundae the caution that marked his earlier works was relaxed.[119] Question XLII, article 2, a discussion of sedition, noted that tyrannical government was unjust because it was directed, not to the common good, but to the private benefit of the ruler. Consequently, unless rebellion engendered harmful disorder, the overthrow of such a government could not be considered sedition. This point was reinforced in Question CIV, "On Obedience" where Aquinas made obedience to secular rulers conditional on the demands of justice. If a ruler had no just title, was a usurper, or if unjust things were commanded subjects were not obliged to obey them. As to killing a tyrant, Question LXIV "On Murder", returned to the Ciceronian image of cutting off a diseased limb. Though it was lawful to kill an evil-doer for the good of the whole community, tyrannicide was forbidden to the private citizen. Only those holders of public office to whom that duty fell were to be allowed to kill.[120]

Two Italian humanists, Coluccio Salutati and Bartolus of Sassoferrato, dealt with the question of resistance in the fourteenth century.[121] Bartolus' Tractatus de Tyrannia clearly distinguished between tyrants "ex parte exercitii", oppressors, and those, "ex defectu tituli", usurpers. The former may be removed only by an overlord though the latter may be justly deposed.[122] In his "Treatise Concerning Guelphs

and Ghibellines" he echoed Aquinas in his belief that action against a tyrant could not be considered sedition, as the rule of such a one was not directed to the public good. If an appeal to the tyrant's overlord proved unsuccessful, removal of the tyrant, even by an individual was legitimate. Salutati's De Tyranno allowed usurpers to be opposed at their entry to power but noted that long-standing obedience might legitimate his rule. Opposing the view of John of Salisbury who, he claimed, only proved tyrannicide frequent, not legitimate, Salutati held that an oppressor was never to be removed by the action of a private citizen. Only by the approval of the overlord or by that of the community could a tyrant be eliminated:

> Let no one, therefore, take his soul in his own hand or make a reason out of his own will and so rise up against his lord, even though the lord be acting as a tyrant! [123]

Salutati went so far in his rejection of tyrannicide as to contradict Cicero and call the death of Caesar a murder. He agreed with Dante who placed Brutus and Cassius in the lowest of Hells to be devoured by the same demon as Judas Iscariot.[124]

Two more possible sources of resistance theory, clearly related, emerged in the fourteenth century. One was the doctrine of popular sovereignty as enunciated by Marsilius of Padua in his Defensor Pacis, written in 1324 as an attack on papal claims. Believing that the power to establish a ruler lay with the people as a whole, Marsilius affirmed their right to depose a prince should his crimes be excessive or

frequent.[125] This belief that the whole was greater than the head was echoed in the conciliarist movement later in the century.[126] Faced with a situation in which two, and then three, popes claimed, simultaneously, to be head of the Church, men such as Jean Gerson and Cardinals Zabarella and d'Ailly pressed for a General Council to resolve the issue. Such a Council, representing the whole Church, would have the power to depose popes and elect a new one. The Council of Constance of 1414 claimed to have such power and forced the removal of three rival popes before Martin V was elected to end the Great Schism. Conciliar theory was revived in the sixteenth century by Jacques Almain and John Major.[127] In Major's History of Greater Britain he followed Marsilius in affirming the right of deposition:

> A people may deprive their king and his posterity of all authority, when the king's worthlessness calls for such a course, just as at first it had the power to appoint him king. [128]

Of the availability of this literature in mid-Tudor England there is much evidence. The classical attitude to tyrannicide, for example, was furnished by Sir Thomas Elyot's The Image of Governance which provided numerous approving examples of the evil ends of Roman tyrants. The deaths of despots such as Heliogabulus, Nero, Caligula, Domitian and Commodus show "that not withstandynge their majestie, and puissance, they for their vices abhominable, were fyrste hated, and afterwarde slayne, and dishonoured by their propre subjectes."[129] Cicero's De Officiis

was published in England in 1534 and 1540.

The classical attitude to tyrannicide was also stated clearly in the 1550 work A civile nosgay.[130] In a section entitled "Whether it is lafull for privat persons to kyll tyrantes, that is cruell offecers",[131] the author starts by considering the case of someone attempting to seditiously gain power in the state. Such a usurper may legitimately be killed by any private citizen. Secondly, a lawful magistrate who acts tyrannously is subject to punishment by those whom he had injured. Here examples of self-defence were adduced as well as the case of a consul taken in adultery and justly slain. However, the work cautioned, if the injury done was not grievous, the injustice ought to be tolerated.

Though no English publishers for either John of Salisbury or Aquinas were found in this period, manuscript versions and European printed editions of both were at hand. Marsilius of Padua's Defensor Pacis was too powerful an attack on the papacy to be ignored by Henry VIII and Cromwell and so in 1535 a translation by William Marshall appeared.[132] It was an expurgated edition which omitted those sections in the original dealing with the popular election and deposition of the ruler as "nothynge appertaynynge to this realme of Englande". To those sections bearing on the people as the source of law are added glosses indicating that this meant Parliament and not "the rascall multytude". Despite these excisions the Defensor Pacis certainly

was the inspiration of much of Starkey's Dialogue and was widely read in mid-Tudor intellectual circles.[133] John Major, who visited England and dedicated works to Cardinal Wolsey, did not publish his History in England. However it was available there and was used by Halle as a source for his Union of two noble families.[134]

The Bible

Finally, the Bible itself invites investigation as a possible source of Tudor resistance theory. Scriptural sanctions had always played a role in buttressing political argument and after Tyndale's clandestine translation of the New Testament, and subsequent complete and official editions in English, the Bible occupied an increasingly large part of the public mind.[135]

The diversity and complexity of the various scriptural writings ensured that there was no single body of thought that could be labelled "Biblical resistance theory". There were numerous citations that could be marshalled to support a number of positions on the question of obedience.

Those who advocated unquestioning obedience to rulers could take comfort from the fates of Old Testament rebels. Numbers 16 tells of how the earth swallowed up those who challenged Moses, while II Samuel 25 - 28 recounts the failure of Absalom's revolt against David. Proverbs 8 provides support for the

divine origin of royal power, stating "By me Kings rule", a position echoed by Wisdom 6. The prophet's description of kingly rights in I Samuel 8, including the right to tax and deprive a subject of his lands, children and property buttressed the argument for the royal power to command absolutely. The same book provides the Old Testament's strongest argument against resistance and tyrannicide when, in I Samuel 26, David refused to kill the tyrannous Saul claiming no one could lift his hand against the Lord's annointed. The New Testament was even richer in injunctions to obedience: Luke 10 tells men to render to Ceasar, and Romans 13 states that all power comes from God, to disobey is to rebel against God. Titus 3 enjoins obedience to government officials while I Peter 2 claims that even rough and unfair masters must be obeyed.

Those seeking to justify their disobedience to rulers could also find scriptural passages to support this position. The foundation of such resistance is that episode in the Book of Acts where the apostles Peter and John are commanded by the secular authorities to cease their preaching. Their reply was that obedience to God comes before obedience to man. Such godly disobedience could take either a passive or an active form. Examples of passive disobedience include Exodus 1 where the midwives refused Pharoah's order to kill Israelite children, I Samuel 22 where Saul's servants refuse his command to kill the priests, and,

in Daniel, the refusal of Daniel and the three Hebrew children to worship idolatrously. Active resistance could be seen most easily in the historical books of the Old Testament. The violent ends of tyrants are many: King Eglon slain by Ehud in Judges 3, Sisera slain by Jael in Judges 4, and Holofernes slain by the herione of the Book of Judith. In view of the accession of Mary the assassinations of Queens Jezabel and Athaliah and the deposition of Queen Maacah are noteworthy. Religious zeal ominously prompted violent action against more than rulers however. Deuteronomy 13 enjoins the death of all those who entice the faithful to serve strange gods, an order specifically including family members. Phineas' murder of two adulterers in Numbers 25 was seen to be a blessing to Israel while a covenant with God in II Kings 11 leads to the massacre of the priests of Baal. The national resistance against a foreign-imposed idolatry that is described in the book of Maccabees might also be relevant to one seeking inspiration or justification for violent action.

Conclusion

The mid-Tudor period, despite several major rebellions, produced no native work justifying resistance to a tyrant and a prevalent theme in writing touching on political affairs was obedience to the secular power. In spite of this there was much that might be used as building blocks for an English

resistance theory. The literature of obedience had conceded that the demands of God's law had priority over that of man's. Theories of popular sovereignty had been discussed and set out in intellectual circles. Chronicles of the nation's history recorded the pictures of tyrants justly brought low for their crimes. Every major continental leader of the reformed churches had written approvingly of various sorts of resistance. The classical and later European views on tyrannicide and deposition were known and Biblical examples might be seen to show the death of tyrants as a godly act. The literate Englishman of 1553 then had ample materials at hand to fashion, should he wish, a justification of violent resistance to his sovereign.

CHAPTER I:

NOTES

1. The best introduction to a study of these uprisings is Anthony Fletcher, Tudor Rebellions (London: 1973).
2. This model of a Tudor rebellion was advanced by M.E. James, "Obedience and Dissent in Henrician England: The Lincolnshire Rebellion 1536", Past and Present, vol. 48, 1970, pp. 3-78.
3. Latimer recounted this in a 1549 sermon. He was contemptuous of Darcy's stand and remarked, "It hath been the cast of all traitors to pretend nothing against the king's person; they never pretend the matter to the king, but to other. Subjects may not resist any magistrates, nor ought to do nothing contrary to the king's laws; and therefore these words 'The King', and so forth are of small effect." Sermons of Hugh Latimer, ed. G. E. Corrie (London: 1844), p. 163.
4. Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, ed. James Gairdner, vol. xii (1) (London: 1890), nos. 900, 901, and 945.
5. Frances Rose-Troup, The Western Rebellion of 1549 (London: 1913), p. 213.
6. S.T. Bindoff, Ket's Rebellion (London: 1949), p. 21.
7. William Tyndale, Doctrinal Treatises and Introductions to Different Portions of the Holy Scriptures, ed. Henry Walter (Cambridge: 1848). Obedience of a Christian Man was first published in Germany but won the approval of Henry, who was given a copy by Anne Boleyn. Tyndale was captured in Antwerp in

1535, tried for heresy and burnt the following year.

8. Ibid., p. 163.
9. Ibid., p. 178.
10. Ibid., p. 197.
11. This work, originally in Latin, was not translated into English until those Protestants fleeing Gardiner and Mary published three editions from their Continental exile. Though Pierre Janelle has produced one of these editions (the Hugh Singleton, "castle of S. Angel" version) in Obedience in Church and State (Cambridge: 1930), all quotations here are from De Vera Obedentia: An Oration made in Latine ("Roane": 1553). Of these translated editions, more below.
12. Gardiner, De Vera Obedentia: An Oration, f. 21v. The sole exception which Gardiner here admitted to the requirement of unquestioning submission, that of obedience against the word of God, is, in this context, clearly not meant to be a serious concession, one that would allow each of his King's commands to be made subject to an individual test of conscience. Yet, as shall be seen, it is an exception that came to be frequently noted by religious writers.
13. For studies of this Cromwellian campaign see Gordon Zeeveld, Foundations of Tudor Policy (London: 1948), and G.R. Elton, Policy and Police (Cambridge: 1972). For more on Morison, especially his religious convictions, see Cissie Rafferty Bonini, "Lutheran Influences in the Early English Reformation: Richard

Morison Re-examined", Archiv für Reformationsgesichte, vol. 64, 1973, pp. 206 - 224.

14. Certayne Sermons, or Homelies, appoynted by the Kynges Majestie to be declared and redde (London: 1547).
15. The Institution of a Christian Man (London: 1537) ff. 64-67. See also John Ponet, A Short Catechisme, or playne instruction, conteynynge the summe of Christian learninge (London: 1553), f. 6v.
16. Richard Morison, An Invective Ayenste the great and detestable vice, treason (London: 1539) Sig. a5v. This work was motivated by the "conspiracy" of the Marquis of Exeter and certain members of the Pole family. Much vituperation was aimed at Reginald Pole whom Morison, who had once owed much to Pole's generosity, called "a Pole of lytel water, and that at a wonderfull lowe ebbe". It is not surprising to see Morison's exile begin when Pole returned at last to England.
17. Sermons or Homelies, Sig. S2v. The passage is from Ecclesiastes 10: 20.
18. Ibid., Sig. R4v.
19. Richard Morison, A Lamentation In Whiche Is Shewed what Ruyne and destruction cometh by seditious rebellyon (London: 1536), Sig. A4.
20. Richard Morison, A Remedy For Sedition Wherin Are Conteyned many thynges, concernyng the true and loyal obeysance, that commenes owe unto their prince (London: 1536), Sig. B. Morison's authorship

of this and A Lamentation was established by C.R. Baskerville in "Sir Richard Morison As The Author of Two Anonymous Tracts on Sedition", Library, series 4, vol. 17,1936-37, pp. 83-87.

21. Thomas Cranmer, "Answers to the Fifteen Articles of the Rebels, Devon, Anno 1549" in Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, ed. John Edmund Cox (Cambridge: 1846), p. 185.
22. Morison, Remedy for Sedition, Sig. B4.
23. Morison, A Lamentation, Sig. A2v.
24. John Cheke, The hurt of sedicion howe grevous it is to a Commune welth (London: 1549), Sigs. D4, E8, F5v, and G5. Cheke, at one time tutor to Edward VI, was to join Morison in exile during Mary's reign.
25. Thomas Cranmer, "A Sermon Concerning the Time of Rebellion", in Miscellaneous Writings, p. 195.
26. Morison, A Lamentation, Sig. B3v.
27. Cheke, The hurt of sedicion, Sig. B1.
28. Morison, A Remedy, Sigs. C4, D4, E4v.
29. Sermons or Homelies, Sig. Sv.; Cheke, The hurt of sedicion, Sig. D2v,; Morison, A Lamentation, Sig. B4v.; William Kethe, Of misrules contending, with gods worde by name (London: 1549?); Thomas Becon, The fortresse of the faythefull agaynst the cruell assautes of povertie and honger, in The Catechism of Thomas Becon, etc., ed. John Ayre (Cambridge: 1844), p. 594.
30. See Henry Brinklow's Complaynt of Roderyck Mors,

ed. J. Meadows Cowper (London: 1874), and Robert Crowley's An information and Peticion agaynst the oppressours of the pore Commons of this Realme (London: 1548) and The way to wealth, wherein is plainly taught a most present remedy for Sedicion (London: 1550). Brinklow, a former Grey Friar, died in 1546. Crowley was a preacher-printer who went into exile under Mary.

31. For an account of this party see Whitney R.D. Jones, The Tudor Commonwealth 1529-1559 (London: 1970). G.R. Elton has recently tried to suggest that the existence of a "commonwealth movement or party" was mythical. "Reform and the 'Commonwealth-Men' of Edward VI's Reign" in The English Commonwealth 1547-1640, ed. Clark, Smith and Tyacke (Leicester: 1979), pp. 23-38.
32. John Hooper, Godly and most necessary annotations in the xiii chapter to the Romaynes (Worcester: 1551), Sig. A5v. The book was reprinted in 1583 although Hooper, bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, was martyred under Mary in 1555.
33. Crowley, The way to wealth, Sig. A3v.
34. Thomas Lever, A Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse (London: 1550), Sig. B7. Lever became a Marian exile after having been a supporter of Lady Jane Grey's claim to the throne.
35. Hooper, Godly annotations, Sig. A7.
36. Thomas Lever, A Sermon preached the fourth Sundaye in Lente (London: 1550), Sig. E8. Tyranny was,

however, something that need not be borne forever or without hope. As a product of the people's sins, this chastisement would be removed when God had sufficiently scourged His people. Then, as Tyndale had said, God would either amend or destroy the tyrant. This would, however, only happen if the people remained obedient and committed their cause to God. To act rebelliously therefore was not only to act against God but also to prolong the agony. Lever, A fruitfull Sermon made in Poules churche in London in the shroudes (London: 1550), Sigs. E6-E7; Crowley, The way to wealth, Sigs. B4v, B7v.

37. Thomas Starkey, An Exhoration to the people, instructynge them to Unitie and Obedience (London: 1536), f. 8v.

38. Hooper, Godly annotations, Sig. B2v. Hooper never specified what the "law of nature" encompassed.

39. Sermons or Homelies, Sig. Sv.

40. Jones, The Tudor Commonwealth, p. 80. Northumberland had attempted to cultivate Knox and use him as "a whetstone to quicken and sharp the Bishop of Canterbury". Knox, however, declined the offer of the see of Rochester. Barrett L. Beer, Northumberland (Kent, Ohio: 1973), p. 143.

41. Nicholas Ridley, The Works of Nicholas Ridley, ed. Henry Christmas (Cambridge: 1843), p. 59. Ridley also complained that "the greatest magistrates" attempted to turn Edward VI against the divines.

42. John Ponet, A Notable Sermon concerninge the ryght

use of the lordes supper (London: 1550), Sigs. G4v-G5.

43. Crowley, The way to wealth, Sig. B4v; Lever, A Sermon preached the fourth Sundaye in Lente, Sig.A2.

44. Thomas Starkey, A Dialogue Between Reginald Pole and Thomas Lupset By Thomas Starkey, ed. Kathleen M. Burton, (London: 1948).

45. G.R. Elton, "Reform By Statute: Thomas Starkey's Dialogue and Thomas Cromwell's Policy", Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. 54, 1968 pp. 165-188. Elton suggests that several of the suggested reforms were taken up by Cromwell and his circle.

46. Starkey, A Dialogue, p. 164.

47. Ibid., p. 153.

48. Ibid., pp. 165-166.

49. Elton, "Reform By Statute", p. 180.

50. The work, originally in Latin, was meant as a private opinion for the eyes of the King only. Unauthorized versions appeared, however, notably a 1555 edition from Strasbourg, refuge of many Marian exiles. A partial English translation was published in London in 1560 entitled The seditious and blasphemous Oration of Cardinal Pole, by Fabyan Wythers. All citations here are from Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church, ed., Joseph G. Dwyer (Westminster, Md.: 1965).

51. W. Schenk, Reginald Pole, Cardinal of England (London: 1950), p. 70. Thomas Starkey called it "the most frantic judgment that ever I have read of any learned man in my life" (p. 72).

52. Pole, Defense of the Unity of the Church, p. 6.
53. Ibid., p. 21.
54. Ibid., p. 55.
55. Ibid., p. 256.
56. Ibid., pp. 274-5.
57. T.B. Howell, ed., A Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treasons and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors, vol. I (London: 1816), col. 861. For an identical opinion see The Catechism of Thomas Becon, etc., p. 327. Lacey Baldwin Smith makes some interesting observations on confessions such as Wyatt's in "English Treason Trials and Confessions in the Sixteenth Century", Journal of the History of Ideas, vol. 15, 1954, pp. 471-498.
58. Gwalter Lynne, ed., The thre bokes of Cronicles, whyche John Carion...Gathered wyth great diligence of the beste Authours (London: 1550), f.*iiiiv. For studies of the historical writing of the period see William Raleigh Trimble, "Early Tudor Historiography, 1485-1548", Journal of the History of Ideas, vol. 11, 1950, pp. 30-41, and F.J. Levy, Tudor Historical Thought (San Marino: 1967).
59. Thomas Cooper, ed., An Epitome of Cronicles Conteining the whole discourse of the histories as well as this realme of England, as all other countries...gathered out of most probable auctors, first by Thomas Lanquet (London: 1549), f. 278.
60. Ibid., f. 277 and f. 251.

61. John Rastell, The Pastime of People (London: 1811), p. 58. The original edition appeared in 1529.
62. John Lydgate, Here begynneth the boke of Iohan Bochas, discryving the fall of princes, princesses and other nobles (London: 1527), f. 103v. Lydgate's fifteenth-century translation of a French translation of Boccaccio's poem includes a tribute to obedience and uses the fall of tyrants to show that princes must rule well or face punishment on earth.
63. Ibid., f. 52.
64. Cooper, An Epitome of Cronicles, f. 197-197v. This accusation appears verbatim in A breviat Cronicle, (London: 1552), Sig. A3.
65. Rastell, The Pastime of People, p. 143. A dissenting opinion is offered in The Cronycles of Englonde, with the dedes of popes and emperours (London: 1528), f. 76. Here it is claimed William ruled wisely as "a worthy kyng, and gave to englyssh men londes largely".
66. Polydore Vergil, Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History, ed., Sir Henry Ellis (London: 1844), p. 191. No complete English translation of the sixteenth-century Latin original exists but the Camden Society has published translations of three different, and lengthy, sections. See also Polydore Vergil's English History vol. I, ed. Sir Henry Ellis (London: 1846), and The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil A.D. 1485-1537, ed. Denys Hay (London: 1950).

67. Robert Fabyan, The Chronicle of Fabyan, whiche be hym selfe nameth the concordaunce of historyes (London: 1542), p. 463 and Edwarde Halle, The Union of the two noble and illustrate famelies of Lancastre and Yorke (London: 1548), Sig. EE1. This latter work was banned by the Marian government in a June 13, 1555 proclamation against heretical books. Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, ed., Tudor Royal Proclamations, vol.II (New Haven: 1969), p. 58.
68. A breviat Cronicle, Sigs. C8v-D1.
69. It is a reflection on the looseness of the use of the term that these royal favorites are themselves referred to as tyrants. Ibid., Sig. D3.
70. The Cronycles of Englonde, f. 109.
71. A breviat Cronicle, Sig. D1.
72. Robert Fabyan, The Chronicle of Fabyan, p. 171.
73. Ibid., p. 316.
74. Halle, The Union, f. 6v. Halle lists thirty-five articles but Fabyan claims there were thirty-eight. Modern historians such as Caroline M. Barron, "The Tyranny of Richard II", Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol. 41, 1968, pp. 1-18, mention thirty-three.
75. These articles are all drawn from Halle, The Union, ff. 6v-8.
76. This is not the case however with peasant uprisings which meet with universal disapproval. The part played by nobles, Parliaments or leaders such as

"Bishop" Jehoiada (Lydgate's Fall of Princes, f. 51v.) is stressed, though chroniclers of English depositions note the approval given these events by "the people".

77. Huldreich Zwingli, Selected Works of Huldreich Zwingli, ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson (Philadelphia: 1901), p. 115. Zwingli's emphasis here is on denying any clerical claims to exemption from civil authority.
78. Ibid., p. 115.
79. Huldreich Zwingli, Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke, 13 vols.,ed. Emil Egli and Georg Finsler (Leipzig: 1905 1963), vol. II, p. 345. Zwingli refers to this constitutional method of deposing tyrants in other works. See, for example, his Exposition of the Faith, meant in 1531 for the French court, in Zwingli and Bullinger, ed. G.W. Bromiley (London: 1953), p. 267.
80. Zwingli, Sämtliche Werke, vol. II, p. 346.
81. There had been tentative discussions in 1523 between the Elector Frederick of Saxony and Lutheran theologians about the legitimacy of resistance to the Emperor by the German princes. Though some of his colleagues differed, Luther himself opposed such resistance. See W.J.D. Cargill Thompson, "Luther and the Right of Resistance to the Emperor", Studies in Church History, vol. 12, 1975, pp. 159-202, p. 170. Cf. Cynthia Grant Schoenberger, "Luther and the Justifiability of Resistance to Legitimate Authority", Journal of the History of Ideas,

vol. 40, January 1979, pp. 3-20, p. 7.

82. The Torgau Declaration, a tortuous acceptance of the right to resistance, resulted from a meeting between the jurists of John of Saxony and Wittenberg theologians. Schoenberger, "Luther and the Justifiability of Resistance", p. 10. For an English translation of Luther's Warning by Martin Bertram, see Luther's Works, vol. XLVII, ed. Franklin Sherman (Philadelphia: 1971), pp. 3-56.

83. Luther, Works, vol. 47, p. 34.

84. Philip Melanchthon in preface to Warnung D. Martini Luther an seyne liebe Dautchen (Nuremburg: 1546), Sig. Bv.

85. Luther claimed that the seven Electors were equal in power, though not in dignity, to the Emperor. Schoenberger, "Luther and the Justifiability of Resistance", p. 14.

86. Hans Baron, "Calvinist Republicanism and Its Historical Roots", Church History, vol. 8, 1939, pp. 30-42, p. 36. Zwingli's 1524 Der Hirt had mentioned, in addition to ephors and tribunes, contemporary German municipal officers whose function was to resist tyranny. Zwingli, Samtliche Werke, vol.III p. 36.

87. This method of choosing kings would ensure a choice more acceptable to God than mere inheritance could produce. Baron, "Calvinist Republicanism", p. 38.

88. Jean Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, vol.II, ed. John T. McNeill (London: 1960), Book IV,

chapter 20, part 22, pp. 1509-10. This is a translation of Calvin's definitive 1559 Latin edition.

89. Ibid., (IV, 20, 31), p. 1519.

90. Ibid., (IV, 20, 30), p. 1517.

91. Heinrich Bullinger, seventh sermon, second decade. This citation is from an Elizabethan English translation Fiftie Godlie and Learned Sermons, tr. "H.I." (London: 1577), p. 174.

92. Ibid., pp. 174-75.

93. Robert Dean Linder, The Political Ideas of Pierre Viret (Geneva: 1964), p. 137. For more on Viret see Linder, "Pierre Viret and the Sixteenth-Century French Protestant Revolutionary Tradition", Journal of Modern History, vol. 38, 1966, pp. 125-137, and "Pierre Viret and the Sixteenth-Century English Protestants", Archiv für Reformationsgesichte, vol. 58, 1967, pp. 149-177.

94. Nicholas von Amsdorf, Bekenntnis Unterricht und vermanung, der Pfarrherrn und Prediger der Christlichen Kirchen zu Magdeburg (Magdeburg: 1550). Though it is by no means "the first formal enunciation of a theory of rightful forcible resistance by any Protestants who can be called orthodox", as claimed by J.W. Allen, A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century (London: 1928, rpt. 1960), p. 104, it is still a significant contribution to the theory of resistance by the inferior magistracy. Theodore Beza, for example, cites the Bekenntnis in his De Haereticis of 1554 and uses it as the basis

for his Du droits des magistrats.

95. Amsdorf, Bekenntnis, Sig. Av.

96. See Christina Garrett, The Marian Exiles (Cambridge: 1938), for accounts of these exiles.

97. A.G. Dickens, The English Reformation (London: 1964, rpt. 1967), pp. 319 ff.

98. John Philpot under interrogation in a Marian prison asked his captors, "Which of you at this day is able to answer Calvin's Institutes?" Charles David Creamam, "The Reception of Calvinist Thought in England", Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. 31, 1949, p. 333.

99. Janelle, Obedience in Church and State, p. xxvii.

100. Huldreich Zwingli, The Ymage of bothe pastours, translated by John Veron (London: 1550).

101. Ibid., Sig. Gv.

102. Ibid., Sig. L6v. The Biblical examples he cites are Jehu and Elijah who slew idolatrous priests. That this concept was not unknown to English divines can be seen by Thomas Becon's Catechism which in commending those who disobeyed commands that were against the will of God, praised Mattathias Maccabee who killed a Jew sacrificing idolatrously, "such a zeal had he unto the law of God, like as Phinehes" who murdered two adulterers. The Catechism of Thomas Becon, p. 20.

103. Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the reign of Edward VI, ed. William B. Turnbull

(London: 1861), pp. 74 and 113.

104. John Strype, The Life of the learned Sir John Cheke (Oxford: 1821), p. 52. Ascham said that while he praised both Magdeburg and its spirit, he disliked the theory of resistance by the inferior magistrate which, he feared, might lead to great commotion and disturbance. (Cheke later spent his Marian exile in Germany.)

105. As A faythfull admonycion of a certen trewe pastor and prophete sent unto the germanes (London and Strasbourg: 1554), translated by "Eusebius Pamphilus", Luther's work became the earliest surviving Marian resistance tract. See Chapters II and III for more on this version.

106. John Bale, The true hystorie of the departynge of... Martyne Luther (Wesel: 1546). Parts of this prayer defending inferior magistrate theory in action were repeated in two Marian exile tracts. See Chapter II.

107. Jane Dawson, "The Early Career of Christopher Goodman and his place in the development of English Protestant Thought", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Durham, 1978, p. 16.

108. Three surveys of this literature are Oscar Jaszi and John D. Lewis, Against the Tyrant (Glencoe,Ill.: 1957); Roland Mousnier, The Assassination of Henry IV, tr. Joan Spencer, (London: 1973); and Wilfred Parsons, "The Medieval Theory of the Tyrant", The Review of Politics, vol. 4 , 1942, pp. 129-143.

109. Ernest Baker, ed., The Politics of Aristotle (New York: 1962). The relevant passage is from Book II, 7, xiii; Leo Strauss, ed., On Tyranny,(Cornell: 1963), p. 9.

110. Strauss, On Tyranny, p. 9. The passage is from Xenophon's Hiero, Book IV, 5.

111. Cicero, Marcus Tullius Ciceroes thre bookes of duties (London: 1556), ff. 116 and 120v.

112. "No offering is more acceptable to God than the blood of a tyrant." Jaszi and Lewis, Against the Tyrant, pp. 10-11.

113. Examples from the Digests and the Justinian Code can be found in S.P. Scott, ed., Corpus Juris Civilis, The Civil Law (New York: 1973), vol. IX, p. 311, and vol. XV pp. 16 and 29-30.

114. John Dickinson, ed., The Statesman's Book of John of Salisbury (New York: 1927), pp. 356 ff., and Joseph B. Pike, ed., Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers (Minneapolis: 1938), pp. 211. These two works combine to form the complete English translation of Policraticus.

115. Dickinson, The Statesman's Book, pp. 372-3. John also forbids the killing of a tyrannous priest unless, after being defrocked, he "lifts a bloody hand against the Church of God" (p. 357).

116. Thomas Aquinas, Aquinas: Selected Political Writings, A.P. D'Entreves, ed., (Oxford: 1965), p. 185.

117. Thomas Aquinas, On the Governance of Rulers, tr. Gerald B. Phelan (Toronto: 1935), p. 55.

118. Ibid., p. 57.

119. Thomas Aquinas, The "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas, Part II (Second Part), tr. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Vol. X (London: 1929).

120. Ibid., pp. 200-201.

121. The relevant works of both these writers are printed in Ephraim Emerton, Humanism and Tyranny (Cambridge, Mass.: 1925).

122. Ibid., p. 145

123. Ibid., p. 93.

124. Despite this opinion, Renaissance Italy often saw tyrannicide as a manifestation of civic patriotism. The assassin of Galeazzo Sforza maintained under torture that his deed was an acceptable offering to God. In Florence, after the 1494 expulsion of the Medici, Donatello's depiction of Judith and Holofernes was placed in public square with the inscription: "Exemplum salutis publicae cives posuere 1495". Jacob Burckhardt, The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy, tr. S.G.C. Middlemore (London: 1914), pp. 36-38.

125. Marsilius of Padua, The Defensor Pacis, ed. Alan Gewirth (New York: 1956), p. 81.

126. The intellectual underpinnings of this movement are outlined by Brian Tierney, Foundations of the Conciliar Theory (Cambridge: 1955).

127. See Francis Oakley, "Almain and Major: Conciliar Theory on the Eve of the Reformation", American Historical Review, vol. 70, 1964-65, pp. 673-690,

and "On the Road from Constance to 1688: The Political Thought of John Major and George Buchanan", Journal of British Studies, vol. 1, 1962, pp. 1-31, for a discussion of the significance of this revival.

128. John Major, History of Greater Britain, ed. Archibald Constable (Edinburgh: 1892), p. 214.

129. Thomas Elyot, The Image of Governance Compiled of the Actes and Sentences notable, of the moste noble Emperor Alexander Severus (London: 1541), p. 6.

130. A civile nosgay wherin is contayned not onelye the offyce and dewty of all magestrates and Judges but also of all subjectes (London: 1550), tr. John Goodale. The work is taken from Melanchthon's Epitome of Moral Philosophy.

131. A civile nosgay, Sigs. D4v - D6v. Quentin Skinner, The Foundations of Modern Political Thought (Cambridge: 1978), vol.II, examines the impact of this part of Roman law on the political thought of Melanchthon and others.

132. Marsilius of Padua, The defence of peace, tr. William Marshall (London: 1535).

133. Franklin LeVan Baumer, "Thomas Starkey and Marsilius of Padua", Politica, vol. 2, 1936, pp. 188-205.

134. Halle, The Union, p. vi.

135. Dickens, The English Reformation, pp. 192-96.

CHAPTER II: THE PROTESTANT PRESS CAMPAIGN 1553 - 1558

Under Edward VI, English Catholics, though occasionally rebellious, did not develop a political theory justifying resistance. Nor, with their young Josiah on the throne, did English Protestants stress the rights or duties of resistance. The death of Edward in July 1553 and the accession of his devoutly Catholic sister Mary brought about changes which forced many Englishmen to confront anew the problem of obedience.

There were some Protestants who, rather than suffer the rule of a Catholic, chose to participate in a palace coup. Archbishop Cranmer, Bishops Ponet and Ridley, and prominent gospellers such as John Cheke and Edwin Sandys took the side, more or less reluctantly, of one whom defeat soon labelled a usurper.[1] Their stated reasons for favouring the claim of Queen Jane were Mary's bastardy, her adherence to the Church of Rome and her willingness to bring Spaniards into the kingdom.[2]

Most Protestants, however, seem to have preferred the rights of the legitimist candidate to that of the daughter-in-law of the unpopular John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland. Reassured by talk of religious toleration,those of the reformed faith were, with the bulk of Englishmen, at first content with Mary's

accession. A London ballad rejoiced that the sister of the "moast godly impe and bud/ of Jessies stocke and roote" had come to the throne where she would doubtless "strongly buyld upon/ Her brothers good fondacion".[3]

This situation did not last long. Protestant loyalty was undermined by the arrests and deprivations of leading clergymen, the reintroduction of Catholic ceremonial, and the expulsion of foreign Protestants. Public sympathy for the regime was also weakened by the Queen's intention to wed a foreigner, the Spanish Prince Philip. Less than seven months after her triumphant entry into London, revolt had broken out against her. This was "Wyatt's rebellion" of January 1554 named for Sir Thomas Wyatt, the leader in Kent of what was to have been a wide-spread rising.[4] Wyatt, the Duke of Suffolk, Sir Peter Carew, and Sir James Croftes had planned to raise various parts of the country and march on London. In the end only Wyatt could muster significant support but, after initial successes, his attempt died at the barred gates of the city. The publicly stated reasons for the rising are noteworthy: the familiar complaints against evil councillors and a mistaken policy. Wyatt's proclamation of his cause stated: "we seke no harme to the quene, but better counsel and counselours, which also we would have forborne in all other thinges save onely in this [marriage]."[5] The Duke of Suffolk, at his trial, based his defence on a claim that a peer

of the realm might lawfully raise men for the purpose of repelling foreigners.[6] As for the idea of William Thomas, a leading conspirator, that Mary ought to have been assassinated, the captured rebels professed to have felt nothing but shock and revulsion.[7] Once again a major Tudor rebellion claimed not to have been aimed at the monarch.

Soon, however, there were to be those who would openly enunciate theories defending active and violent resistance to the Queen. These men were among the writers behind the prolific and vociferous literary campaign directed by Protestants against the Marian establishment. This literary warfare had begun very shortly after Mary's victory. In August 1553 a pamphleteer in London called for a Protestant show of force to persuade the Queen to repudiate her Catholic councillors:

> Noblemen and gentlemen favouring the word of God, take counsel together and join with all your power and your following! Withdraw yourselves from our virtuous Lady, Queen Mary, because Rochester, Walgrave, Inglefield, Weston and Hastings, hardened and detestable papists all, follow the opinions of the said Queen.[8]

Stephen Gardiner, Chancellor and the bishop of Winchester who had regained his see from Ponet, was to be "exorcized", and the tract ended with the call: "Draw near to the Gospels, and your guerdon shall be the crown of glory." Shortly after this work appeared, another was produced with what is perhaps the first of the many references to Mary as the figure of a certain Old Testament queen:

> Gods worde ye can not a byde
> but as your profetts yow telle
> in those yow maye be well comparyd
> to wicked Jessabell.[9]

When the "Michael Wood" press began to operate from a secret location in the autumn of 1553 the tract war had started in earnest. The campaign continued throughout Mary's reign, conducted from England at first, then, after October 1554, from bases on the continent. By the time it ended at the news of Mary's death it had produced over one hundred works, of which at least eighteen defended the concept of resistance. To understand this Marian resistance theory it is necessary to place it in context, examining the entire corpus of opposition writings and the exile which shaped it.

The Marian Exiles and their Presses

When, by late 1553, it had become clear that Protestantism was not to be tolerated in England, it was to cities such as Strasbourg and Frankfurt that a stream of Protestant divines, students, and laymen began to come.[10] Here, where they had friendly contacts and some assurance of a haven,[11] they sought not only the freedom to practise their own form of worship, but also the opportunity to define and preserve their national religion for the day that would see its return to England.[12] Substantial colonies of exiles were also initially established at Emden, Zürich, and Wesel with smaller groups or individuals at such places

as Worms and Duisburg.[13] A quarrel amongst members of the congregation at Frankfurt resulted in many members leaving that city.[14] Some departed for Basle but most went, in late 1555, to strengthen a small English presence in Geneva where Jean Calvin arranged for a church for them.[15] Lutheran suspicion, and perhaps a connection with plots against Calais, led to the migration of the Wesel colony to the Bernese town of Aarau in the summer of 1557.[16]

Though there was considerable contact between these various groups of refugees, there was often a lack of unity on important issues,[17] and each colony had its own distinctive nature depending on its constituent members and the temper of its hosts. Strasbourg seems to have attracted more than its share of Edwardian notables. Here were to be found John Ponet, bishop of Winchester, Sir John Cheke, tutor of Edward VI and Queen Jane's Secretary of State, Sir Anthony Cooke, another of Edward's tutors, Sir Richard Morison, ambassador to the Emperor, Sir Peter Carew, a Henrician Member of Parliament and a Wyatt rebel, prosperous merchants such as John Abell and Thomas Heton and a group of divines including Richard Cox, Chancellor of Oxford and Dean of Westminster, Edmund Grindal, Edwin Sandys and John Aylmer. This colony, along with that at Zürich, rejected the attempts by some exiles at Frankfurt to further reform English Protestantism, particularly in areas of ceremonial. It was to Zürich that Peter Martyr came

after harassment by Lutheran elements in Strasbourg, bringing a number of Englishmen with him.[18] The presence of so many divines among the English at Zurich, men like John Jewell, Thomas Becon, John Parkhurst,and James Pilkington, led Fuller to dub this colony "a flock of shepherds".[19] A more recent writer considers the Strasbourg and Zurich exiles the "establishment in exile".[20]

The Frankfurt colony was notable for its quarrelsomeness and its liturgical experiments. Prominent members included Christopher Goodman, John Foxe, the brothers Christopher and John Hales, John Bale and Robert Horne. The Wesel/Aarau colony was unique in that it was the only group of exiles in which artisans predominated. The Duchess of Suffolk's presence at Wesel had drawn Englishmen to the town, but, when the colony was forced to move, her retinue made its way to Poland leaving Thomas Lever to conduct the remaining exiles to their Swiss refuge.[21] The Emden congregation was under the leadership of Edwin Scory, Edwardian bishop of Chichester, called "our superintendant" by his congregation.[22] Said to have been one of the richest colonies, its location made it an important centre for the printing and distribution of exile propaganda.

That group of exiles which stood out from all the others in several ways was that at Geneva. From a population of less than two dozen dwelling there before the arrival of those leaving Frankfurt in

1555, it grew to almost two hundred by the time of Elizabeth's accession, a quarter of all those known to have been in exile.[23] Here were to be found the most fervent and uncompromising of those who fought for further reformation in the English church.[24] It was the refuge of men such as John Knox, Christopher Goodman, William Fuller, William Whittingham, and Anthony Gilby, all of whom were destined to press for further church reform under Elizabeth. Geneva was also the sanctuary were its exiles seemed happiest to be. Knox deemed the city rich in God's eyes "by the plentifull aboundance of his heavenlie graces", and praised the "just rigor of justice, and the severitie of discipline". Whittingham thought it "the mirror and model of true religion and true piety", while Goodman praised "that happy agreement and solid peace which by the grace of God we enjoy in this place".[25]

In all these refuges were men experienced in controversial writing and novices anxious to take up the pen in defence of English Protestantism. In July 1554, John Ponet at Strasbourg wrote to John Bale, newly arrived in Frankfurt, to propose a concerted literary attack on their opponents:

> Ballets, Rymes, and short playes that be not deare, and will easily be borne away doe much good at home amongst the rude peple...the papists shew ther faces so shamelessly, and being destitute of all godly weapons presse so sore apon us, that it is an easy matter for any that have ben a scholer in gods servyce to wounde them wher he list. Blind fury hath made them witles and if we joyne strengthe agaynst them, we shall make them bootles...The unlearned must not be ydll. Ther dayly exhortations shall incoradge the laborers, the plowmans whissell is no vayn instrument the horse laboreth more

> cherfully when he is cherished. Let us all feyght in a throupe together, the learned with ther pens, the riche in ther substance, the poor in dispersinge those things that may edify, and all together with our prayers dayly to God.[26]

At the time Ponet wrote, most Protestant opposition literature was still being published in England, chiefly by John Day who used several false imprints to disguise his work. The first of these proclaimed his publications to have emanated from the press of Michael Wood in Rouen.[27] The last tract to use this imprint, A Soveraigne Cordial For a Christian Conscience, bears the date of May 11, 1554. In this same month Day used two other imprints. As "Nicholas Dorcastor" of Wittonburge"[28] he published several works by John Knox[29] and as "Conrad Freeman", supposedly of Greenwich, he printed the first of the Marian resistance tracts A faythfull admonycion of a certen trewe pastor.[30]

While John Day was still secretly working in England, another London printer, Hugh Singleton, had made his way into exile.[31] Associating himself with the Wesel printer Josse Lamprecht, he began to print English Protestant tracts in late 1553. The Lamprecht press in 1553-54 used the imprints of the "Sign of the Golden Bible", supposedly in Strasbourg and the "Sign of St. Peter", avowedly printed "in Rome, before the Castel of S. Aungel".[32]

In October 1554 the Protestant opposition press suffered a serious blow with the arrest of John Day.[33] In that month it was also reported:

> By divine inspiration rather than through any human

> artifice or device, a certain perverse heretic and secret seducer of the people has been discovered. He is the author of all the plots, writings and books that have been published against our catholic faith, which he caused to be printed, as I hear, secretly at a certain place in Flanders...They say England held no blacker criminal than he in matters of religion; he denounced many of his fellow conspirators and accomplices who have been seized too.[34]

Fortunately for the exiles other printers, by now, had been found for the publication of the increasing volume of their writings. By the end of 1554 two valuable allies had been made amongst the fraternity of continental printers. One was Wendelin Rihel at Strasbourg who, in that year, printed the first edition of what was to grow into Foxe's Acts and Monuments, his Commentarii rerum in ecclesia gestarum. The second was Egidius Van Der Erve, a former exile himself in England, who was now printing in the coastal town of Emden.[35] From the later months of 1554, throughout 1555 these two presses, along with Lamprecht at Wesel, printed the overwhelming majority of opposition literature produced by the exiled Englishmen.

The fracture of the Frankfurt colony over ceremonial usage brought about a change in the pattern of exile printing. Some dissident members of the congregation left for Basle and took up employment in the printing trade there. Among these men were John Bale, Laurence Humphrey, and John Foxe.[36] A larger body went to Geneva and arranged with several of the numerous printers in that city to publish their works.[37] Thus 1556 saw printing carried out in these two cities

as well as those previously mentioned.

The last two years of Mary's reign produced a dramatic change in the use of continental presses. Each of 1554, 1555 and 1556 had seen in the neighbourhood of two dozen exile works printed. Only half this number emerged in 1557 and 1558.[38] Not only were the numbers cut in two (and, as we shall see, the types of tracts printed changed), but the Emden and Strasbourg presses all but ceased to produce exile literature. Geneva, Basle and a new press at Wesel, that of de Zuttere, were the only sources of Protestant printing by the close of Mary's reign.

A discussion of presses employed by the English Protestant opposition would be incomplete without mentioning that occasional use was made of printers not mentioned above. In 1554 an enterprising Englishman persuaded a printer in Danzig to print a seditious tract, taking advantage of the man's ignorance of the English tongue.[39] John Bradford in 1556 was said to have brought a printer from England to Antwerp to publish his Copy of a lettre, a work warning of the Spanish threat to England.[40] In addition to these locations on the Continent, opposition literature was also produced in England even after Day's arrest. Much of this was in the form of handwritten bills[41] but some tracts given evidence of an English printing.[42]

Once printed the tracts were then smuggled into England from ports such as Emden or Antwerp.[43] Distri-

butors such as George Eagles, alias "Trudge-over-the world", or Ralph Allerton[44] would then either scatter the works abroad, to be picked up by passers-by, sell them, or read them to secret congregations of the faithful.[45]

Though Miles Huggarde, one of the regime's more able apologists, spoke slightingly of the Protestant literary campaign[46] it is clear that the government viewed the situation as serious. A series of legislations, proclamations, and commissions were aimed at stemming the flow of seditious literature from the Protestant presses[47] but in the end succeeded only in making its possession more dangerous.

The exile writers who were the source of this campaign are not always easy to identify. Many books were not signed at all and to others pseudonyms or initials were attached. "Gracious Menewe", "Hugh Hilarie" and "Eusebius Pamphilus" disguised Thomas Becon and John Bale.[48] "R.P." was Robert Pownoll, and "D.I.P.B.R.W." masked Doctor John Ponet Bishop of Rochester and Winchester.[49] Often the names of real and stout Catholics were chosen, less to conceal than to infuriate -- Miles Huggarde, John Cawood and Michael Throckmorton were all victims of this ploy.[50]

When such veils are put aside it can be seen that most of the tracts to which we can, with any confidence, ascribe authors are the works of divines or divinity students. Bishops like Ponet, Miles Coverdale and Bale led other pamphleteering clergy including Knox,

Goodman, Robert Horne and Bartholomew Traheron. Robert Pownoll and William Whittingham were among the students engaged in the tract war. There were laymen involved in this campaign but their contribution was, numerically speaking, small. William Turner, physician and botanist, and John Bradford, gentleman,[51] both wrote tracts from exile.

Almost every English colony of any size in Germany and Switzerland had its complement of writers. Strasbourg had Ponet, Horne and Sampson; Frankfurt had Bale, William Kethe and John Olde; Emden was the home of John Scory; Basle sheltered Foxe and Laurence Humphrey; and Geneva, Knox, Goodman, Whittingham and Anthony Gilby. Even the small Wesel/Aarau colony could boast the talents of Coverdale, Traheron, and Pownoll. In all, those exile authors and translators whom we can identify number twenty-one.[52] These men, and those other exiles who provided their financial support and arranged for the printing, smuggling, and distribution of their works,[53] felt that this tract campaign was a vital part of their lives in exile, a duty to their religion which could be discharged in the relative freedom and safety of their continental refuge. The Frankfurt colony made provision for the campaign when drawing up their New Discipline:

> Item, that such as shall thereunto seem most meet of the Congregation, shall be appointed to translate into English some such books as shall be profitable, either for the instruction, or for the comfort, of our country[men], in this our exile, and affliction of our country.[54]

What sorts of works then did these exiles write

and export? What is the relationship of those tracts supporting resistance, to the larger body of opposition literature? Scholarly writing on these questions has tended to stress the fewness of the resistance writers and their separation from the mainstream of exile thought. Jennifer Loach has spoken of "a very small group of writers" whose theories of resistance "were regarded with horror not only in England but also amongst their fellow-exiles".[55] In fact an examination of the corpus of these writings will show that the contribution to the pamphlet campaign made by writers favouring resistance was a major one. It will also provide a basis for comparing the whole to that part favouring resistance, a comparison that will show how similar the themes and preoccupations of resistance writings were to the mainstream of exile writings.

The Tracts of 1553

The earliest surviving exile tract is dated 1 October 1553, two days after the Queen's coronation. Entitled An Admonishion to the Bishoppes of Winchester, London and others,[56] it raises issues and takes stands that were to become commonplace in the Protestant opposition literature of Mary's reign. It is a warning to the higher Catholic clergy that religious oppression will bring down a punishment from God onto the heads of the perpetrators. It reminds them, as well, that

their present position of eminence is due to providential intervention,[57] and that providence can remove them if their position is abused. Thus the first exile tract warns oppressors of tyrannicide, bidding them remember that "god can raise a Hiehue when his pleasure is, and will doo it when Achab least looketh for it."[58] The only way to avert divine punishment was by repentance.

The next tract to be published sounded one of the most constant notes to be heard in opposition literature, that of the necessity for steadfastness in faith. Whether Christian faith maye be kept in secret announced that it "is not inough for a christian man to say: i know the Masse is naught: but to obei civil law and orders, i will do outwardli as other do yet in my heart, i will abhor it, and never thinke it to be good".[59] This rejection of nicodemism brought the question of obedience to civil authority to the attention of the Protestant community. Having taught the virtues of submission under Henry and Edward and, for the most part, having applauded the accession of Mary, the Protestant leadership was placed in what might have been an awkward position, if they had not always preached that obedience was conditional. This point was made clear in the three translations of Bishop Gardiner's De Vera Obedentia which the underground presses turned out in late 1553. No obedience was to be given against the word of God. Any law which ordered attendance at the mass or other popish

service is against God's word: "ergo it is not to be obeyed".[60]

The first Protestant response then to Marian attacks on their religious conduct was to preach disobedience. The second was to counsel flight. Two tracts in late 1553 recounted the escapes of Protestant clergymen from the clutches of the papist persecutor.[61] Bale, in comparing himself in his flight to the Apostle Paul, sought to make fleeing into exile a respectable option. In this he was echoed by Robert Horne whose Apologie prefaced two homilies of Calvin counselling steadfastness in the faith and flight from idolatry.

Wishing to broaden the base of the opposition to the Marian regime these writers pointed to the resumption of secular power by the Catholic clergy and its horrible implications for the nobility of England. It was the intention of the clergy, said one tract, to kill not only all the learned Protestants but every noble as well, as part of the plot to place the clergy or their puppets in all positions of any influence.[62] The translator of De Vera Obedentia held that the clergy, led by Gardiner, had already rendered the nobility "utterlie defaced, and almost brought into contempt". At this point the author sought to make an important point. Why had the nobility been brought so low? Clearly it was because of their behaviour under Edward VI. Their present state had been brought about as a punishment by God "for

makinge Christes glorious gospell, a cloke for their covetousnes, pride and carles carnall life: and for their frumping, neclecting and rejecting the curteous monicions of goddes prophetes of England, whose wordes we finde true nowe, and alas, to true".[63] Horne claimed that Protestant ministers had preached at the nobility until they would hear no more sermons -- a sure sign that God's plague was close at hand.[64] This line of reasoning had two important ends. Firstly, it was to awaken the nobility to their responsibilities and align them with the Protestant cause in the defeat of what was said to be a common enemy. More importantly, however, it provided the exiles with a powerful myth, one that explained their persecution and the situation in England as part of God's plan. At a stroke what had appeared a demoralised, scattered church whose greatest supporter had gone to his execution denying the faith,[65] had become the church of God's own agents. Their utterances and sufferings were not those of frightened men scurrying to safety, but were the actions of men whose relation to God made them the tools of providence and placed them at the centre of the English political stage. What they had prophecied under Edward, that being a lip-gospeller was not enough, that greed and hypocrisy would prompt God's vengeance, had come to pass. Their calls for repentance, their warnings to the nobility, though seeming to come from a handful of discredited clerics, were spoken with the voices of prophets.

Those few tracts issued in 1553 raised important issues for the exiles; chiefly, that the current situation was the result of incorrect attitudes toward the true religion, that the utterances of the preachers were of paramount importance, and that the way to preserve the faith under the coming persecution was through steadfastness or flight. However, though all accepted that the plagues descending on England were well deserved, there became evident a certain tension in the exile position. This is well illustrated by the contrast between the first two tracts to bear the date 1554.

The Tracts of 1554

A letter sent from a banished Minister,[66] dated 4 January 1554, takes an extremely passive attitude to the troubles of the Protestant church, an attitude that is reminiscent of Tyndale. Comparing the faithful to pilgrims and to sheep for the slaughter, the author states that glory is attained by suffering, "not bi drawing out the swerd with Peter, but bi having our heads striken of with the same".[67] The wicked are the instruments of God, to do as He wills. Nothing can be done by the persecutors unless God allows it, whether they know this to be so or not.[68] The persecuted are urged: "Let us be contented withal, and above al thinges, let us avoyde murmurations against the higher powers who are Gods instruments, to worke his will."[69] Those who would not heed this advice are

reminded that the rebellious Israelites perished in the desert and that gold is purified only by fire. Persecution, though arduous, could be a good thing to the Church.

A different attitude, much more impatient and less willing to accept the rigours of the argument that God was the ultimate author of the troubles, is present in An Excellent And A right learned meditacion.[70] Here Bale accepts that the plagues besetting England are deserved and that the persecuted faithful have indeed sinned against God, but in an impassioned outburst Bale demands of God that his fury be directed, not against them but against the papists, servants of Antichrist. Bale points out that the Protestants are being persecuted for God's sake:

> For this word which we preach, beleve and confesse, is not our worde, but thy word, not our expositions or construinges, but the expositions and construinges of thy holye Spirite...If it be a syn to preach this, beleve this, and after our callinges, every one of us to confesse and protest this: then Lorde thou art a synner which commaundest and requirest this of us.[71]

Bale asserts that the persecutors are not interested in punishing the faithful for their sins but seek only to wipe out God's true worship. God is called upon to awake and defend His people from those who would hinder them.

The ambiguity of this position could easily lead to a defence of violent resistance to persecution. If the oppressors are made to appear as if they are fighting against God, instead of acting as His avenging rod, it takes little additional effort to justify

resisting their persecutions. Not surprisingly then this prayer from the Excellent Meditation appears twice again, only slightly altered, in 1554. The first appearance is in the exile's earliest resistance tract, A faythfull admonycion of a certen trewe pastor, dated May 1554. Here it is called "A praier to be sayd of all trewe christianes against the pope and all the enemyes of Christ and his gospell",[72] and fits in well with the call of Luther and Melanchthon to resist popish violence. The second appearance is in a July 1554 work by John Knox, A faythfull admonition...unto the professours of Gods truthe in England, which, although not a resistance tract, is filled with violent language against the persecutors and Queen Mary in particular.[73]

If the exiles differed in 1554 over the spirit in which to view the persecution, they were all agreed on the need to define and defend true religious doctrine. If Englishmen were to remain steadfast in the faith it was necessary that they be aware of those tenets they were to suffer for. Said John Bale: "It is not now time (faithfull Christians) to be beastly ignorant, expeciallye in the poyntes of Christen religyon, and in those lawes whiche God woulde have knowne."[74] Consequently 1554 saw the publication of a number of tracts dedicated to the exposition of Protestant doctrine. Chief among these was a work claiming to be the product of a group of "poore banished men".[75] This Confession discussed the creeds and explained Protestant stands

on Church, Ministry and Sacrament. The Mass was a prime target for the Protestant pamphleteers, who sought to label it as an idolatrous service. Knox ominously noted of the murder of idolaters by the Israelites (killings that included family members and, if need be, whole cities): "Here is a playne declaration, what God requyreth of them that will continue in league with him; and what he hath damned by his expresse Word."[76] More temperate in language in condemning the mass were The Doctrine of the Masse booke and The Resurreccion of the Masse, the latter in verse.[77] Priestly celibacy, auricular confession, prayers for the dead and the use of Latin were all targets for pamphlet attacks.[78]

1554 also saw the first appearance of works reporting on Catholic persecutions and extolling the behaviour of Protestant victims. The death of Lady Jane Grey, portrayed not as a usurper but as a martyr, received two accounts in that year as did the recounting of the 1553 November convocation debate.[79] John Foxe broadened the battlefield by publishing his account of the history of Wycliffe and the Lollards, the first version of what was to become his Acts and Monuments.[80]

Within the framework of these various types of tracts, certain exile attitudes emerged in 1554 and are worthy of note. In the light of later works, it is important to consider the attitude toward Mary as a female ruler and to find that hostility to the concept

pre-dates the notorious books of Knox and Goodman by several years. Thomas Becon, in his Humble Supplication, linked women's rule to all that was wicked.

> For in the steade of that verteous prince, thou haste set to rule over us an woman, whom nature hath formed to be in subjeccion unto man, and whom thou by thyne holy Apostle commaundest to kepe silence, and not to speake in the congregacion. Ah Lord, to take away the empire from a man, and to gyve it unto a woman, semeth to be an evident token of thyne anger toward us English men...[Though] we fynd, that women somtime bare rule among thy people, yet do we rede, that suche as ruled and were quenes, were for the moste part wicked, ungodly, supersticious, and geven to idolatry and to al filthy abhominacion, as we may se in the histories of quene Jesabel, quene Athalia, quene Herodias, and such like.[81]

Knox in a 1554 tract found the saying true that the usurped government of an affectionate woman was rage without reason.[82] These observations on the unnaturalness of female rule and its origins in God's desire to punish a kingdom led, in neither tract, to an advocacy of resistance, but they did presage a hostile interest in gynocracy which was to endure throughout Mary's reign.

Another popular theme in the tracts of 1554 was the threat of foreign domination of England resulting from the marriage of the Queen to the Spanish Prince Philip. Bale's Meditation bewailed the imminence of an assured involvement in foreign wars, of alien oppressors stealing English goods, and English women ravished by pox-ridden papists. He prayed that God would enter the hearts of the estates of the realm, nobles and commons, to induce a repentance and a

patriotic unity that would withstand the evil effects of foreign influence.[83] Knox spoke of the dangers of making "a proude Spaniarde Kynge" and castigated Mary for having an English name but a Spanish heart.[84] It is noteworthy that this xenophobia is absent from the Letter from a Banished Minister, A Soveraigne Cordial For a Christian Conscience,[85] and other tracts taking the passive line to the persecution.

The exile writers also began to evince an interest in economic affairs. This stemmed partly from a desire to play upon the fears of the English for their property under the new regime, and partly from that Edwardian Protestant distaste of the economic order which we associate with the "commonwealth men". Bale's prophecies in his Meditation are an example of the former, and Thomas Becon's comments typify the latter. Having excoriated the Edwardian lip-gospellers, in his Confortable Epistle, for their covetousness, and love of wanton voluptuous living, Becon lists among those sins that Protestants should avoid: oppressing the poor, raising rents, greed and taking of incomes.[86] Despite the claims of a recent historian,[87] the "edge of idealism" that was such a feature of certain Edwardian elements was not blunted during the reign of Mary, but rather continued to be expressed in the exile tracts.

Another theme emerging from the pamphlets of 1554 is the attitude of the writers to the nobility of England. A certain ambiguity is also evident on this issue. On the one hand the experience of the preachers

with that class under Edward had not been an entirely happy one and their behaviour since Mary's accession justified accusations of hypocrisy and time-serving. On the other hand the nobility was deemed the only group capable of opposing the Catholic clergy and achieving Protestant ends. Accordingly the nobility was always close to the centre of exile attention, and discussion of gentlemen's duties was frequent. All agreed that it was the duty of the nobility to protect and further the gospel. Knox expected them to prosecute idolaters and shield the preachers from the tyranny of the bishops but he anticipated little reaction to this call: "But howe many now of the nobilitie within Englande boldely speaketh in the defence of Gods messinger is easy too be tolde."[88] Consequently Knox placed little hope in action by the gentlemen. A more optimistic assessment is evident in a tract by William Turner, probably written to influence thinking in England about the time of the second 1554 Parliament. Addressed to the young gentlemen of England, Turner called on them to fulfill their duties to defend the commonwealth and true religion by ridding the realm of "wolves" -- the persecuting bishops Gardiner, Bonner and Tunstal.[89] The proper arena for this struggle was to be Parliament where the gentlemen should enact provisions for an educated clergy, congregational control of churches, and the return of abbey lands to the support of the church.[90] Perhaps realizing the improbability of this taking

place, even the optimistic Turner was forced to conclude with the observation that for the present the best course of action was "ether to playe the wolves with the wolves, or els to flye out of this countre, to such a countre as are no suche wolves in, as here are like to be."[91]

Attitudes to the Queen in Protestant literature roughly parallel those to the nobility. Those taking a hard line are content to vilify her and to expect nothing but persecution, while those taking a passive view of the troubles are slightly less harsh toward her. Knox numbers among the former.

> And of Ladye Marye who hath not herde? that she was sober, mercyful, and one that loved the common wealthe of England. Had she (I saye) and suche as nowe be of her pestilent counsel ben sent to hel before these dayes, then should not their iniquitie and crueltie so manifestlie have appeared to the worlde. For who coulde have thought, that suche crueltie could have entred into the hert of a woman? and into the hert of her that is called a virgine?[92]

This attitude can be contrasted with that of Bishop John Hooper who treated the Queen as one who might yet stop the tyrants when he prayed: "God (in whose hands are the hartes of Kinges) open the hart of the queenes majesty to espie them out what they be and so to weede them out, that thei no longer be suffered to trouble the congregation of God."[93]

The Tracts of 1555

In 1554, the first full year of Mary's reign, the exile press set out the basic themes that would

dominate Protestant opposition writing for the rest of her tenure. The keynotes were disobedience, steadfastness, true doctrine, and repentance. These were sustained in the 1555 tracts, though events in England brought about shifts in emphasis. The reconciliation with Rome achieved by the second 1554 Parliament and the start of the burnings prompted exiles to more thought about ways to end the persecution. Though repentance is still preached in virtually every pamphlet there is a marked increase in the number of tracts seeking a political solution in addition to the spiritual.[94]

Among the first of the politically-inclined works was one claiming to be a plea to the Queen printed by the royal printer, John Cawood.[95] In fact it was a Protestant attempt to undermine support for the Marian regime and enlist the aid of Parliament and the gentlemen. Though A Supplicacyon to the quenes majestie, in form, begins as an appeal to Mary to reconsider her religious policy, the author loses no chance to point out that the Queen sprang from an incestuous marriage and that Gardiner, her chief minister, had said so in writing.[96] The treachery of the higher clergy is stressed and English gentlemen are warned that these churchmen have two ends in mind: the return of abbey lands to the church, and the coronation of Philip who favours their doings. The self-interest of the gentlemen is thus appealed to in order to prevent such mischief. They are reminded that the Pope's decision

not to enforce his rights to sequestered church property could be changed at any time,[97] and that their positions, property, and lives were not secure under the imminent Spanish rule. For the sake of self-interest the "lords and comons of the Parliament house" were asked to pass no laws giving power either to the bishop of Rome or to the Spaniards. In an attempt to awaken the political leadership of England to its responsibilities, the author boldly linked the nobles' present cause and danger to the Wyatt rebellion of 1554. Steven Gardiner, he claimed, was a menace now due to his clerical, hispanophile maneuvering. It would have saved much grief if the bishop had been put to death before such plans had aroused the rising of 1554: "And then had ther bene many noble men and gentellmen savyed a lyve which for hys cawse rose perceiving such things to be at hand which be now come to passe."[98]

Other appeals to the nobility, as the political solution to the problems of the Protestant opposition, were also made in 1555. William Turner's A new booke of spiritual Physik for dyverse diseases of the nobilitie and gentlemen of England[99] and William Kethe's Seeing Glasse[100] approached the issue in different ways. Kethe's attitude is that by now familiar reminder that the present plagues were due to the scorning of the gospel under Edward and that the nobility was threatened with destruction by the upper clergy.[101] He warned that abbey lands would be seized despite promises to

the contrary and prophesied that the entire country was in peril of subversion and desolation. William Turner was concerned with a change in the self-image of the nobility and their restoration as a healthy governing class. Using an extended medical metaphor, Turner proposed that the nobility be cured of such diseases as dropsy (a puffing up due to greed), apoplexia (a numbness and loss of feeling and speech due to unlearnedness), the Romish pox, and spiritual leprosy (a shame of the nobility due to the actions of parvenues and bishops), by their regaining of lost secular power through an awareness of the rigorous demands of true nobility. Austerity, learning and social responsibility were to be the marks of the ruling class who would repress the ambitions of the "crowish stert uppes" and the clergy.[102] Because part of the duty of the true governor was to see the gospel promoted and the church working effectively Turner seems to suggest that the revitalization of the nobility would ensure a Protestant triumph.

Those taking a passive attitude to the persecution were less willing to place any trust in the ability of the nobility or Parliament to play a useful role. Miles Coverdale noted that "for the parliament and statutes therof, no man of wysdome can thynke other wyse, but that looke, what the rulers wyll, the same muste ther be enacted...it goeth not in those houses by the better parte, but by the bigger part".[103]

The Temporysour pointed out that the failure of the English ruling classes was due to sin which had caused God to take away "our vertuous Kinges and Princes,...and the hartes of our Nobilitie, Counsayl and Captaynes in makinge them faynthearted and weakelinges, being contented to submit theyr neckes under the yocke of straungers".[104] As all was in God's hands the only remedy lay in repentance and steadfastness in suffering. Martyrdom was extolled and the recent English victims placed in the same tradition of the Maccabees, Christ and the Saints.[105]

The interest of the exiles in providing doctrinal instruction for their brethren in England continued in 1555. Coverdale provided works on justification and the resurrection; Ponet issued a defence of priestly marriage;[106] Thomas Becon attacked auricular confession and the mass; Thomas Cottesford translated a Zwinglian confession of faith; and John Olde attempted a defence of Edwardian Protestantism.[107]

The Tracts of 1556

This intensified in 1556 as the Genevan colony's writers entered the pamphlet war in earnest. Now well settled in the Swiss city after their departure from Frankfurt, these exiles sought to propagate their faith, and their views on church organization, through a campaign that concentrated on the doctrinal. Their chief vehicle for this was The form of prayer and ministration of the sacrament or uses in the English

congregation at Geneva, whose Latin translation Ratio et forma also appeared in 1556.[108] That colony also produced a version of the Psalms, a catechism, a book by Anthony Gilby on predestination, and two works by Bishop Ridley edited by William Whittingham.[109]

Other exile centres were not lax in this regard either and works on Protestant doctrine by Olde, Scory, Robert Watson, Ponet, and other, anonymous, writers were produced.[110] Of these several are of special interest. Olde's two works on the Antichrist show that apocalyptic concepts had influenced Marian exile thought.[111] This vision helped to bolster exiles' claims to spiritual authority by showing how the true church could be persecuted and the false seem to triumph for a time. Foxe in Basle echoed these beliefs which his play Christus Triumphans, a work which he termed a "comoedia apocalyptica".[112] Foxe showed how the true church had suffered historically and included contemporary English events in his dramatic account.

Two of the characters in Christus Triumphans, Theosebes and Hierologus, have been identified with the 1556 martyrs, Ridley and Latimer.[113] Their works and their deaths, along with those of other victims, became a popular topic of the exile press in 1556. Two editions of the Latimer-Ridley Conferences appeared that year, one edited by William Whittingham and the other by John Olde. Ridley's views on the Eucharist also appeared appended to the Whittingham

edition and in the Latin De coena dominica, published at Geneva.[114] Archbishop Cranmer's martyrdom made possible the publication of two of his works -- the Confutacion of unwritten verities, a defence of the primacy of Scripture, and his Copy of certain letters sent to the Quene, and also to doctour Martin and doctour Storye.[115] The martyr John Philpot was also the subject of an exile book, The Examinations of John Philpot, published at Emden.[116] These works provided an opportunity, not only to assert Protestant doctrine, but to show that learned men were willing to die in testimony of its veracity.[117]

Despite the continued persecutions that had driven other exiles to advocate violent resistance as the answer to their problems[118] there were still some English writers on the continent in 1556 who believed the situation required only a spiritual response. As it had been sin and hypocrisy that had brought on the plagues, so might a changed life and repentance bring about their end. This belief found a particularly striking setting in the anonymous Trewe mirrour, the most irenic of all the exile writings. Set in the form of a dialogue between Theophilus and Eusebius,[119] Protestant doctrine is explained in a mild and persuasive manner with the emphasis on Christian love. One character proclaims:

> there be (men) of both sides that meane wel, and wyshe well unto all men, and I doe not thynke the contrarye but if there were charitie in our heartes, and we could fynd in our heartes to love one another, we should agree and prosper well inough.[120]

Though the tract differs here from the more virulent mainstream of exile literature, it is, nonetheless, in agreement with the orthodox view of the political ills of the nation. The author dreads the rumoured coronation of King Philip, calling it a plague and "an utter desolacion of Englishe bloud". The nobility, fickle and ambitious, seek to serve whoever rules the roost, though in the end it will mean their own destruction. Quarrels would be started amongst the nobility and other devices set afoot to weaken the native ruling class that the Spaniards might rule. In aiding this, it was said, Queen Mary had broken her father's will and statute law.[121] Despite this political analysis the author's remedy eschewed political action. Though the Spaniard's coronation spelt disaster for England, the fact that it had been determined by God meant it was not to be resisted. Instead the author urged a patriotic unity which allowed free debate, fasting, praying, and repentance as the ways to avert the nation's destruction. This remarkable tract ends with the Catholic moved but unconvinced and anxious to speak another time. The harsh treatment accorded the ruling classes in Trewe Mirrour is also found in several other exile works of 1556. One of the charges against them was that of hypocrisy and inconstancy. Latimer, speaking of Parliament, complained:

> The more part in my time did bring furth the sixe articles, for then the king wold so have it, being seduced of certen. Afterward the more part did

> repel the same, our goode Josias willing to have it so. The same articles now again (alas) another greater, but wurse part, hath restored. O what an uncertaintie is this? But after this sort most commonly are mans procedings.[122]

Lever, in a continuation of the Edwardian "commonwealth" tradition demanded what was to be done with those nobles

> that have more uncharitable gaines, then righteous possessions...that have conveyed by covetousnesse, pretie portions of a kingdome, unto little or nothing of their owne inheritaunce...that can be content to take profite of other mennes evill policies, and also themselves to devise and practise craftie cruelnesse, that have burned and banished the preachers of the gospel of Christ to receive and set up sayers and singers of a ceremonious masse?[123]

One of the most disturbing aspects, to the exiles, of noble behaviour was the part they played in the religious persecutions in England. All the warnings that the clergy were manipulating the nobility and seeking their destruction seemed to be going unheeded and John Olde felt obliged to warn that those nobles who consented to or participated in the persecution were as guilty as those agents of Antichrist, the bishops.[124] He warned them not only of divine displeasure but noted that should another ruler come to the throne he would punish all those responsible including the nobility.

Attitudes toward Mary in those tracts of 1556 not urging resistance were mixed. There were still those reluctant to blame her personally for the nation's troubles and who chose to point the accusing finger at the bishops. John Olde notes how "the Quenes majestie is circumvented to make a law to stablish the Pope's

usurped power".[125] The editor of Cranmer's Confutacion blamed Mary for the destruction of the Edwardian church and the restoration of the pope but decided that she had been "seduced by the perjured prelates". Even so Mary was likened to Jezebel and a marginal notation remarked that "the wil of a woman must be folowed, or els al the fatt is in the fier".[126]

The image of Queen Jezebel and King Ahab was also employed by Thomas Lever who related how these two had persecuted God's true prophets and favoured the priests of Baal. Lever was prepared to blame Mary for her acts and attack the dangerous implications of the Catholic loyalist myth which attributed the Queen's relatively easy accession to an act of God, equivalent to a miracle: "Many do imagine that if God work wonderfly to set up any in high authoritie, then whatsoever such a one doth commaund, is good and godly".[127] In fact the government of such a ruler could very well be ungodly and thus unworthy of obedience in some things. Lever however drew back from these dangerous implications of his own and counselled only passive disobedience and repentance that God might remove the tyrant either by changing his heart or by destroying his power and person.

The Tracts of 1557

A striking feature of the Protestant press campaign in 1557 is the drastic reduction in the number

of books produced -- thirteen, as opposed to the thirty-one printed in 1556. This is accompanied also by changes in the place of publication and authors. The death in late 1556 of John Ponet and the removal of the Köpfel press from Strasbourg to Worms[128] meant that only two works by English exiles were published in Strasbourg in 1557. The Emden press of Van Der Erve printed but one book of the exiles in that year though that printer continued to operate for several years to come.[129] The death in 1557 of Josse Lamprecht who had faithfully served the exile cause as their Wesel printer,[130] and the dispersal of that colony meant that Englishmen were forced to find other printers.[131] These dislocations plus perhaps the extra difficulties of smuggling books into a country now involved in a continental war might account for the drop in the numbers of books printed.[132] There was however only slight change in the type of works issuing from the exile colonies.

In addition to the usual mixture of resistance tracts,[133] works on doctrine, and exhortations to steadfastness, two works stand out. One was the English translation of the New Testament by the Genevan exile William Whittingham.[134] Its attractions included roman type, textual division into verses, and copious marginalia added to aid those with neither the wealth to buy, nor the leisure to read, Biblical commentaries. These marginalia, many drawn from Calvin's various commentaries, give an insight into the Genevan exiles'

thoughts on political obligation which are of interest to this study. The emphasis here is clearly on the conditional nature of obedience. The passage in Romans 13 enjoining obedience for the sake of conscience is noted by: "For no private man can contemne that governement which God hathe appointed without the breache of his conscience: and here he speaketh of civil magistrates." A note in Matthew 26 declares: "The exercising of the sworde is forbide to private persones." Titus 3 extends this obedience even to non-Christian princes but adds the crucial exception: "Although the rulers be infideles, yet we are bounde to obey them in civil polices and where as they commande us nothing against the worde of God." This limitation on obedience is stressed in the note on the injunction for servants to obey their rough and unjust masters in I Peter 2: "In all obedience this must be before our eyes, that we obey in the Lord: for if anie commande things against God, then let us answer, It is better to obey God then men."

The second notable work of 1557 was a small tract by John Foxe entitled Ad inclytos ac praepotentes Angliae Proceres, Ordines et Status totamque euis gentis Nobilitatem, pro afflictis fratribus Supplicatio, printed at Basle. As a plea for the intervention of the nobility against the machinations of the clergy, it is in the same tradition as the works of William Turner.[135] While Turner spoke before the persecutions had had much impact and was vague about how the

nobility was to regain its power, Foxe's work was written in the midst of the burnings and is specific in its rejection of violence and his dependence on gentleness and persuasion. The nobility was urged to put a halt to the killings by an approach to the Queen and the institution of a policy of toleration. Only John Olde and the anonymous author of the Trewe Mirrour ever approached Foxe in an abhorrence of violence.

The Tracts of 1558

The non-violence of Foxe and Whittingham's New Testament is starkly contrasted with the mood of the exile works in 1558. Though every year since 1554 had seen at least two editions of tracts urging violent resistance, the last year of Mary's reign saw this sort of work outnumber all other types of writing.[136] Gone were the hopeful warnings to the nobility, the praise of passivity and martyrdom, and the embarrassed excuses for a persecuting ruler. Those voices urging rebellion now dominated in an outburst of frustration and rage emanating from Geneva and Wesel.[137] The exile state of mind had become such that every one of their works published in 1558 was by an author who approved of resistance to the higher powers.

Conclusion

This examination of the total output of the opposition press takes us nearer to an understanding

of the relationship of works advocating resistance to the mainstream of exile writings. It can clearly be seen that, though there was by no means a unanimity of support for violent resistance, its proponents were more than "a few" disaffected pamphleteers whose ideas were generally despised. In fact writers like Becon, Bale, Ponet, Traheron, Goodman, Gilby, Whittingham, Knox, and Pownoll produced most of the works issuing from the exile presses[138] and were the very men counted upon by their fellows to define and defend English Protestant orthodoxy during its period of trial. It must also be emphasized that these men were not irresponsible theorists but were figures at the centre of the stage, leaders of the various communities. John Ponet was the highest ranking English cleric in exile; John Bale, also a bishop, had an international reputation as a Protestant historian; John Knox, Christopher Goodman, and Anthony Gilby were all, at one time, elected ministers of the large Genevan congregation of which William Whittingham was a senior and a deacon; Bartholomew Traheron had been offered the divinity lectureship at Frankfurt. If we can show, in the following chapter, that the themes of the main body of writings -- the call to steadfastness, the need for repentance, the xenophobia, the concern with the position of the nobility, an uneasiness with women's rule, a distaste for economic greed and hypocrisy, and the necessity for purity of religious doctrine --

can be found as well in resistance writings it will be much harder to place these works at the periphery of exile life.

CHAPTER II:

NOTES

1. Several of these men, as we have seen, had been Edwardian proponents of obedience but became members of Queen Jane's Privy Council. Sandys, vice-chancellor of Cambridge University, preached a sermon in favour of the coup. Garrett, The Marian Exiles, p. 283.
2. These reasons, soon to become familiar complaints, were stated in a letter from Jane's Council to the Sheriff and Justices of Kent, July 12, 1553. Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report on the Manuscripts of Allan George Finch, Esq. vol. I, (London: 1913), pp. 1-2.
3. Richard Beard, A Godly Psalme of Marye Queene, (London: 1553), Sig. A5.
4. The best account of this rebellion is D.M. Loades, Two Tudor Conspiracies (London: 1965).
5. Quoted by John Proctor, The historie of wyates rebellion (London: 1554), ff. 8v-9. Loades however is surely correct in seeing that the true intent of the rising was Mary's deposition. Two Tudor Conspiracies, pp. 19 and 54-55. Malcolm R. Thorp, "Religion and the Wyatt Rebellion of 1554", Church History, vol. 47, 1978, pp. 363-380, has recently argued that Protestant fervour played a significant part in inspiring the revolt.
6. Loades, Two Tudor Conspiracies, p. 103.

7. Thomas was said to have asked "Whether were it not a god 'devise' to have all these perils that we have talked of, taken away with very little bloodshed, that is to say, by killing of the Queen." Fourth Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records (London: 1842), p. 248. Those Thomas asked claimed to "detest the horryblenes of the cryme". Loades, Two Tudor Conspiracies, p. 19, and Howell, State Trials, vol. I, col. 863.
8. Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, vol. XI, ed. Royal Tyler (London: 1916), pp. 173-174. All but Dr. Weston, dean of Westminster, were conservative Catholic laymen who were named to Mary's Privy Council. Patricia M. Took's unpublished 1978 University of London thesis, "Government and the Printing Trade, 1540-1560", p. 275, says of this work that it was the product of "young hotheads at Court; it was clearly not the authentic voice of the protestant community."
9. British Museum, Harley Ms. 424, f. 59, printed in Frederick J. Furnivall, Ballads From Manuscript, vol. I (London: 1868), pp. 431-4,and John Foxe, Acts and Monuments, ed. Stephen Reed Cattley, 8 vols. (London: 1837-39), vol. VIII, pp. 717-18. Foxe claims the poem was laid out for the Queen herself to find.
10. Christina Garrett's The Marian Exiles is still the best introduction to this phenomenon. Unfortunately the value of some of her exile biographies is all too often marred by frequent flights of sheer

imagination, e.g., her belief that William Cecil masterminded an organized exodus and that the lit rgical troubles at Frankfurt were the fault of John Ponet's ambition.

11. Cities such as Strasbourg, Frankfurt, and Zürich were attractive to Englishmen because of their histories of contact with the English Reformation or because of hospitable municipal authorities. The welcome these cities accorded the exiles, because of the efforts of John Burcher and Peter Martyr in Strasbourg, Valerand Poullain in Frankfurt, and Heinrich Bullinger in Zurich contrasts with the hostility shown by some Lutheran cities to other Protestants expelled from England. Frederick A. Norwood, "The London Dutch Refugees in Search of a Home, 1553-1554", The American Historical Review, vol. 58, 1952, pp. 64-72.

12. In February 1554, Peter Martyr at Strasbourg, informed Bullinger:

> English youths have come over to us in great numbers within these few days, partly from Oxford, and partly from Cambridge: whom many godly merchants are bringing up to learning, that, should it please God to restore religion to its former state in that kingdom, they may be of some benefit to the church of England.

Hastings Robinson, ed., Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, 2 vols. (Cambridge: 1846-47), vol. II, p. 514.

13. Thomas Fuller, The Church History of Britain, vol. IV (Oxford: 1845), p. 208.

14. A near-contemporary account of this disagreement can be found in Edward Arber, ed., The Troubles begonne at Frankfort (London: 1908).
15. Charles Martin, Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Geneve au temps de Calvin, 1555-1560 (Geneva: 1915), p. 37.
16. Garrett, The Marian Exiles, pp. 50-51.
17. The two notable disagreements concerned the call by the Frankfurt colony in 1554 for an united English church based in that city and the appeal in late 1558 by the Genevan exiles for a common policy on the future shape of English Protestantism.
18. Marvin Walter Anderson, Peter Martyr -- A Reformer in Exile (Nieuwkoop: 1975), p. 199.
19. Fuller, The Church History of Britain, vol.IV, p. 206.
20. W. Stanford Reid, "The Divisions of the Marian Exiles", Canadian Journal of History, vol. 3, 1968, pp. 1-26. More than any other recent student of the exile Reid accepts some of the more speculative views of Christina Garrett. He allows her opinion that the Strasbourg settlement "was planned with political objectives" and sees the start of the Frankfurt troubles in Ponet's attempt to exercise jurisdiction from Strasbourg, pp. 20 and 22.
21. Garrett, The Marian Exiles, p. 51.
22. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. VIII, p. 540, from the examination of Elizabeth Young in 1558.
23. Martin, Les Protestants Anglais, p. 45.

24. An interesting omission occurs in The forme of prayer published by the Genevan colony in 1556 after the quarrels in Frankfurt. The book calls for Protestants in England to flee to Continental refuges but mentions neither Strasbourg nor Zürich among the suitably godly churches.

25. John Knox, An Answer To...an Anabaptist (Geneva: 1560), p. 196; quoted by E. William Monter in Calvin's Geneva (New York: 1967), p. 186; Robinson, ed., Original Letters, vol. II, p. 769.

26. British Museum, Add. Ms. 29, 546, f. 25. This letter is sometimes dated 1555 (D.M. Loades, The Reign of Mary Tudor (London: 1979), p. 360), or 1556 (Leslie P. Fairfield, John Bale (West Lafayette: 1976), p. 202), but internal evidence makes 1554 the most probable date. By July 1555 the tract war was already well under way and Ponet's proposal would seem superfluous in such a circumstance. Ponet also mentions that his first book is ready and asks Bale for advice on how to get it published. By July 1555 Strasbourg had become one of the printing centres for the exiles, which in 1554 it was not, and Ponet would not have needed to write to Frankfurt for assistance. Moreover by July 1555 Ponet had already published at least one book. The first edition of his Apologie...Answeringe...Thomas Martin, published at Strasbourg, bears the date April 1555.

27. Leslie P. Fairfield, "The Mysterious Press of 'Michael Wood' (1553-1554)", The Library, series 5, vol. 27, 1972, pp. 220-232. Fairfield lists ten tracts with this imprint but there were probably at least two more issued which have not survived -- Admonition to the Parliament, attributed to Beza, and The Champion of the Church, addressed to the nobles of England. Joseph Ames and William Herbert, Typographical Antiquities, vol. III (London: 1790), pp. 1572 and 1578.

28. Patricia M. Took, "Government and the Printing Trade, 1540-1560", claims however that the "Dorcastor" imprint masks the identity of the London printer Anthony Scoloker, working at Antwerp. Though she offers no proof for her assertion that the books were printed in the Dutch city, she notes that London printers did have connections with their Antwerp colleagues. Moreover "Nicholas Dorcastor" is said to be a near anagram of Anthony Scoloker.

29. Works by John Knox issued under the "Dorcastor" imprint in May 1554 were An admonition or warning, The Doctrine of the Mass Book, and A percel of the VI Psalme which included a letter from Nicholas Ridley. Another "Dorcastor" book, the Confession of the belefe of certain poore banished men is also dated May 1554 but Christina Garrett, in "John Ponet and the Confession of the Banished Ministers", Church Quarterly Review, vol. 137, 143-144, pp. 47-74 and 181-204, argues that the tract is misdated.

She believes it was directed at the second of the 1554 Parliaments and thus belongs to July to September of that year. Her argument for this is not a strong one and it is probably best, in most cases, to give the benefit of the doubt to stated dates. For more on John Day see C.L. Oastler, John Day, the Elizabethan Printer (Oxford: 1975).

30. In addition to the John Day version, another edition of the Faythful admonycion survives. While it differs slightly in the marginalia, and is printed in different types, it too professes to be the work of Freeman at Greenwich, printed "With the most gracios licence and privilege of god allmighty Kyng of heaven and erth" in May 1554. This work has been attributed to the press of Wendelin Rihel at Strasbourg on typographical evidence. As the need for a simultaneous publication of an English language tract in England and the Continent seems puzzling the Strasbourg edition suggests itself as a later edition, reprinted in Germany after Day ceased printing in England in October 1554.

31. H.J.Byron, "Edmund Spenser's First Printer, Hugh Singleton", Library, series 4, vol. 14, 1933-34, pp. 121-156 outlines Singleton's long career of printing opposition literature.

32. An example of the former is Thomas Becon's A Confortable Epistle dated August 1554. An example of the latter imprint is John Knox's July 1554 A godly

letter sent too the fayethfull.

33. John Gough Nichols ed., The Diary of Henry Machyn, (London: 1848), p. 72. "The xvj day of October cam rydyng owt of Northfoke on John Day prynter and ys servand, and a prest, and an-odur prynter, for pryntyng of noythe bokes, to the Tower."

34. October 6, 1554. Count Giovan Tommaso Langosco di Stroppiana to the Bishop of Arras. Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, ed. Royall Tyler, vol. XIII (London: 1954), pp. 62-73. John Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. VI, p. 651 lists some of the sixty Londoners arrested, at this time, "for the having and selling of certain books which were sent into England by the preachers that fled into Germany and other countries." Christina Garrett, "The Resurreccion of the Masse By Hugh Hilarie -- or John Bale (?)", Library, series 4, vol. 21, 1940-1, pp. 143-159, p. 156, argues that John Bodley was the mastermind who had been arrested.

35. Frank Isaac, "Egidius Van Der Erve and His English Printed Books", Library, series 4, vol. 13, 1931-2, pp. 336-364, p. 339; A.F. Johnson, "English Books Printed Abroad", Library, series 5, vol. 4, 1949-50, pp. 273-276; and Harry Carter, Books Printed at Emden Before 1560 (Oxford: 1963), also deal with Van Der Erve and clandestine exile printing.

36. J.F. Mozley, John Foxe and His Book (London: 1940), p. 51. Foxe used his employer Oporinus to publish

his apocalyptic drama Christus Triumphans in 1556.

37. The Genevan printer most frequently used in 1556 by the exiles was Jean Crespin, but Badius, Blanchier, Houdoyn, Poullain and Reboul were all employed by the end of Mary's reign.

38. Of works printed in 1554, twenty-three survive; of 1555 and of 1556, thirty-one. Tracts of which we know some printing details but which have not survived can also be added to these totals, e.g. The Ungodliness of the Hethnicke Goddes, by "J.O.", 1554; Prayers for pockie papists, c. 1555; and Whittingham's 1556 translation of Beza's Treasure of Truth. Thirteen surviving works are attributed to 1557 and twelve to 1558.

39. Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Mary, 1553-8, ed., William B. Turnbull (London: 1861), p. 105. One hundred copies, to be "thrown in the streets and highways that people might read them", reached London in April 1554.

40. Shiela R. Richards, ed., Secret Writings in the Public Records, Henry VIII - George III (London: 1974), p. 9. The information was in cypher in a letter from Mary's ambassador in Paris, Wotton, to the Queen, 21 May 1556. The printer's name was said to be "Dunhill, who either is at Antwerp or resorteth much thither", but no English printer of that name is known. The printer Thomas Duxell, a founding member of the Stationer's Company in

1557, is not known to have been involved in clandestine printing. A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, ed., Edward Arber, vol. I (London: 1875), p. xxviii. An associate of Bradford, captured with him at Scarborough, was named John Donnynge, but there is nothing to link him to the printing trade. Garrett, The Marian Exiles, p. 349.

41. Acts of the Privy Council, 1554-56, ed. John Roche Dasent (London: 1892), p. 19. On the discovery of a seditious bill in May 1554 the Lord Admiral was ordered to find the perpetrator by giving orders that the handwriting of all those able to write be examined.

42. The revised Short Title Catalogue, vol. II, ed. Jackson, Ferguson and Panzer (London: 1976), lists an edition of A Copye of a verye fyne and wytty letter, an anonymous 1556 tract on the vices of the Catholic clergy, as emanating from the press of John Kingston and Henry Sutton for John Wayland. Some doubt about this attribution must be raised as Wayland was no friend to the Protestant cause. Late in Mary's reign he turned apprentice Thomas Green over to the authorities for possession of an exile tract entitled Antichrist. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. VIII, p. 521.

43. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. VIII, pp. 536-545, gives an account of the examination of book smuggler Elizabeth Young of the Frankfurt and Emden colonies.

The Marian authorities in 1558 referred to Emden as the place "where all these books of heresy and treason are printed." For the Antwerp book connection see Acts of the Privy Council 1556-58, ed. John Roche Dasent (London: 1893), pp. 124-25, and Calendar of State Papers, Foreign 1553-58, p. 190.

44. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. VIII, pp. 393-95 and 417. Both Eagles and Allerton were executed for their part in the illegal book trade.

45. Miles Huggarde, The displaying of the Protestantes (London: 1556), f. 69v, spoke contemptuously of "a fewe threehalfpennye bookes, which steale oute of Germanye", but Thomas Greene paid four pence on account and twelve pence to come later for his copy of Antichrist in 1558. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. VIII, p. 522. Sales of tracts was one way to finance the print campaign, and help from generous continental printers was another. William Nicholson, ed., The Remains of Edmund Grindal (Cambridge: 1843), p. 221. Despite all this it was gloomily noted by some in Frankfurt that "all men that have, in these miserable days, yet hitherto caused books to be set forth in our tongue, have rather lost, than won, by them." Arber, ed., Troubles, p. 167.

46. Huggarde said the common proverb was, "It is as true as the protestants libel." Exile books, he claimed, were despised and ignored:

> Men regard not Turnors boke of the wolfe, nor yet the cropeared foxe, Hornes Apologie, Bales

> vocation, Poynetes folysh confutacion against the lerned treatyse of doctor Martin stande in no steade, Noxes doctrinall of the Masseboke, and your newe revived practise of prelates, are counted here as vile. The Champion of the faith, and your prayers for the pockie Papistes,are estemed here as trashe. Your boke of your stinking martyrs, and Makebraies declaracion of his faithe, are in no reputacion.

Huggarde, The displaying of the Protestantes, ff. 118-119. Such a catalogue seems to indicate only that the exile communities were succeeding in bringing a wide variety of books into England.

47. Loades, The Reign of Mary Tudor, pp. 336-8. See also D.M. Loades, "The Press Under the early Tudors", Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society, vol. 4, 1964-68, pp. 29-50, and "The Enforcement of Reaction", Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 16, 1965, pp. 54-66; Frederic A. Youngs Jr., "The Tudor Governments and Dissident Religious Books" in C. Robert Cole and Michael E. Moody, ed ., The Dissenting Tradition (Athens, Ohio: 1975), pp. 167-190, and The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens (Cambridge: 1976); and Patricia Took's thesis "Government and the Printing Trade".

48. Thomas Becon as "Gracious Menewe" wrote A Confutacion of that Popishe and Antichristian doctrine and A Plaine subversyon, both published in Wesel, 1555. John Bale seems the most probable author of "Hilarie's" The Resurreccion of the Masse (London? or Wesel?: 1554), and the Faythfull admonycion of "Eusebius Pamphilus".

49. Though both Pownoll and Ponet declared their author-

ship of other tracts, Pownall's An Admonition to the Town of Callays (Wesel: 1557) used only initials.

50. Huggarde, the writer, saw his name appear on the 1555 resistance tract Certaine Questions, published at Wesel. The printer John Cawood and Cardinal Pole's associate Michael Throckmorton were named, respectively, as authors of A Supplicacion to the Queen's Majestie (Strasbourg: 1555) and A Copye of a verye fyne and wytty letter (Wesel and London (?): 1556). Anonymity seems to have been sought for reasons of security from the recriminations of the Marian regime. Not only were the writers thus hidden, but also family and associates still as home in England. The man who freed Edwin Sandys from his Marian prison begged him "while you are there [in exile] you write nothing to come hither; for so ye may undo me." John Ayre, ed., The Sermons of Edwin Sandys (Cambridge: 1842), p. xi. Disguising the printer's identity by false colophons and the avoiding of distinctive types and initials also prevented the English authorities from bringing pressure to bear on the cities sheltering the exiles. Fear of this sort of action may have been behind the absence of exile printing in Frankfurt. The magistrates of Danzig were embarrassed by the attempt to use their city as a printing centre and had to apologize to England. Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, 1553-58, p. 105.

51. John Bradford is noteworthy as the single author found outside the exile colonies in Switzerland and Germany -- the only one of those English soldiers and adventurers gathered in France to have taken up the pen as well as the sword.

52. To this total might be added a handful whose initials, or other information, are available to provide the basis for an educated guess at an identity.

53. The effort and co-ordination needed for the production of even a single tract raises the question whether the entire campaign was centrally directed. Christina Garrett, The Marian Exiles, pp. 104-8 and 114-17, has argued that, for a time, the pamphlet war was under the direction of one man, Sir John Cheke, resident in Strasbourg. Patricia M. Took, "Government and the Printing Trade", pp. 231-33, names Sir Anthony Cooke, also in Strasbourg as one of a number of men who might have directed the campaign. D.M. Loades, "The Press Under the Early Tudors", pp. 41-42 has opposed this sort of view. Given the reluctance of the exile groups to take a unified stand on important issues a single overseer of the literary effort seems improbably. Effective inter-colony co-ordination would have stopped blunders such as Thomas Sampson's translation of Gualter's Antichrist with an eye to publication only to be told in 1556 that some other Englishman had already finished it.

Robinson, ed., Original Letters, vol. I, p. 174. Nor would Thomas Cottesford, in April 1555, have gone to the trouble of translating Zwingli's Confession before discovering that an English version had long existed, if a unified plan for exile publications had existed. Rather more probable is that each colony was responsible for its own writing and printing arrangements (though the Grindal-Foxe correspondence over the martyrology does show co-operation in one project). Ponet, for example, had urged Bale to "playe the bishop amonge [his] companiones", in finding men in Frankfurt suited to the writing of shorter works. B.M. Add. Ms. 29, 546, f. 25. The Genevan colony's concentration in 1556-67 on works of a certain type also shows a conscious decision on the part of the congregation to focus their efforts. Co-ordination among the colonies may well have existed in matters of smuggling and distribution.

54. Arber, ed., Troubles, p. 166. When it was objected that this sort of work could prove dangerous, the reply was that it was foolish not to publish, "as though by speaking nothing, it might be persuaded that we do nothing here but sleep."

55. Jennifer Loach, "Pamphlets and Politics, 1553-58", Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol. 48, 1975, 31-44, pp. 42-43.

56. This is the first of the "Michael Wood" tracts, now ascribed to the secret English press of John Day.

57. An Admonishion to the Bishoppes, Sig. A2. "God hath marveously saved (you) from such as hated you and set you in hye dignitie, more than ever you had in your life."

58. Ibid., Sig. A7. "Hiehue" is Jehu of I Kings 19 and II Kings 9-10. This is a bold and significant threat, for Jehu murdered not only the idolatrous priests but the royal family of Jezabel and Jehoram as well.

59. Whether Christian Faith maye be kept in secret, Sigs. A4v-A5. L.P. Fairfield, "The Mysterious Press", attributes the authorship of this tract, dated 3 October 1553, to John Hooper, the imprisoned Bishop of Gloucester, later martyred.

60. De Vera Obedentia ("Roane": 1553), ff. 21v.-22. The edition cited is dated 26 October but as it is the second, amended, edition of a translation also bearing that date it seems probably the publication date was somewhat later. This is borne out by the comment (f. 62v), "God knoweth our miserable state in this exile." While Fairfield, "The Mysterious Press", p. 229, claims John Bale had a hand in this work, Bale himself in Scriptorum Illustrium maioris Bryttaniae (Basle: 1559), p. 722 lists "De vera obedentia, Gardinieri" among the works of John Olde. As Bale, however, was reticent about admitting to the authorship of anonymous exile works, this does not rule out his participation in

one or all of the three, slightly differing, versions.

61. John Bale, The Vocacyon of Johan Bale...his persecucions...and finall delyveraunce (Wesel: 1553), and Robert Horne, Certain homilies of m. Joan Calvine... with an Apologie of Robert Horn (Wesel: 1553).
62. Horne, Apologie, Sigs. B8-C.
63. De Vera Obedientia, Sig. B2v.
64. Horne, Apologie, Sig. B3v.
65. The apostasy of John Dudley seemed at the time a significant victory for the Catholics whose presses tried to make much of it. John Cawood printed for an English audience The saying of John late Duke of Northumberlande uppon the scaffolde (London: 1553). The attempt by Imperial and other continental Catholic authorities to capitalize on this propaganda coup is described in W.K. Jordan and M.R. Gleason, "The Saying of John Late Duke of Northumberland upon the Scaffold, 1553", Harvard Library Bulletin, vol. 23, 1975, pp. 139-179, and 324-355. The admonishion to the bishoppes called Dudley "a disceitful tirant deceived with hopes of pardon", (Sig. A8), while De Vera Obedentia labelled him an errant traitor with "his unlearned learning and combred conscience", Sig. A5v.
66. The authorship of this tract, another of the "Woode-Rouen" works, is an, as yet, unsolved question.
67. A letter sent from a banished Minister, Sig. A4v.
68. God "putteth a bridel in the mouth of tirants, so

that although they pretende to make a long race, yet he doth stop them sodenly." Sig. A7.

69. Ibid., Dig. A5.

70. The Short Title Catalogue, ed. A.W. Pollard and G.R. Redgrave (London: 1926), no. 1293, lists the author of this 3 January 1554, "Woode-Rouen" tract as John Bale. L.P. Fairfield, "The Mysterious Press" (p. 225), lists Bale as a possible author along with Thomas Becon, Thomas Sampson, and William Turner. The language of such phrases as "sluttish swine tubbes", "swynish sorte of sodomite" and "pocky papistes, fôrein fraikes and lecherous epicures" certainly points to John Bale, of whom it was said: "Bale seems to be not so much writing as barking in print", a man who "very seldom succeeded in being anything but bilious." W.T. Davies, "A Bibliography of John Bale", Oxford Bibliographical Society, Proceedings and Papers, vol. 5, 1936-39, pp. 201-279, p. 203.

71. An Excellent And A right learned meditacion, Sigs. A4v-A5.

72. A faythfull admonycion, Sig. K2. The origin of the prayer may give a clue as to the authorship of this extremely important resistance tract. It made its first appearance (in the form it took in Bale's Excellent Meditation) in the Notable Sermon by John Ponet, 1550, entitled "A prayer agaynst the Pope and Turkes, whiche be the mortall enemies of Christ,

hys word and hys churche." However the essence of the prayer can be traced back even further to "The Christen prayer of the most noble prynce electour Johan Frederick duke of Saxon, in hys godlye warre agaynst Antichrist", translated by John Bale in The true hystorie of the Christen departynge of the reverende man, D. Martyne Luther, ff. 31-32v. It seems probable that the prayer was made known to Ponet by Bale who was his close Edwardian associate. Ponet's reworked version was then employed by Bale in the Excellent Meditation and provides a link between those two men and A faythfull admonycion. As the latter book was a translation of a German resistance tract, Bale's knowledge of that language and his acquaintance with resistance theory (the Elector's "Christian Prayer" was a defence of inferior magistrate theory in action), made him a prime candidate. The pseudonym employed, "Eusebius Pamphilus", provides another link with Bale. As Eusebius Pamphilus was the most distinguished of the historians of the early Christian church, and a bishop to boot, the name itself points to Bale, bishop of Ossory and the foremost antiquarian and historian that the English Reformation could offer.

73. This tract labelled "Kalykow" in fact was printed by Egidius Van Der Erve at Emden. The prayer is found at Sigs. H8-Iv in the 1554 edition and p. 327 in The Works of John Knox, ed. David Laing,

6 vols. (Edinburgh: 1846-95), vol. III.

74. John Bale, A declaration of Edmonde Bonners articles of 1554 (London: 1561), Sigs. A2v-A3. (This citation is from the Elizabethan reprint of Bale's Marian work of which no copy survives.) As might be expected of a work by the author of the exile's first resistance tract, this book is contemptuous of the Marian Bishop of London's views on obedience. For papists and "bitesheeps" Bale claimed that the faithful had been given "this perfit rule of obedience. Ye shal rather...in suche case, obey God than menne." f. 54. Bale also posed the extremely provocative question: "Is it or no, any high way to sedicyon, or meane to sorowfull tumulte, to suffer so manye newe straungers to enter into the land? Yea, so filthy, so wicked, and so cruel as the Spaniardes are knowne to be?", and concluded that a few years of sorrow would certainly provide the answer. f. 55v.

75. This pamphlet was The confession of the belefe of certain poore banished men of the "Dorcaster" Press. Christina Garrett in The Marian Exiles (pp. 279-280); and "John Ponet and the Confession of the Banished Ministers", has tried to identify this Confession, with its decidedly Swiss view of the Lord's Supper, with the Lutheran confession "sealed up with little twigs", castigated by Peter Martyr in that letter reprinted in George Gorham, ed., Gleanings of A Few Scattered Ears

(London: 1857), pp. 333-35. The two, as an examination clearly shows, are not the same but Martyr's biographer Marvin W. Anderson, accepting Garrett's identification, takes the mistake a step further. In Peter Martyr (pp. 176-177) Anderson claims that Martyr's dislike of the Confession was based on political grounds, the Confession apparently being too revolutionary for one who saw the sorry experience of the 1549 rebellions in England. In fact the Confession follows the Letter from a Banished Minister and adopts an unobjectionable, passive tone: "Let us therfore take this correction with al mekenes of heart and submission under the hand of God, that he may exalte us when it shalbe his godly pleasure." Sig. "A2", (really A4).

76. Laing, ed., The Works of Knox, vol. III, p. 192. This quotation is from An Admonition or warning that the faithful Christians in London, Newcastle, Barwycke and others may avoide Gods vengeaunce (Emden: 1554).

77. The former, one of the last of the John Day printed books, was attributed to Knox by Huggarde, The Displaying of the Protestantes, f. 118, while Christina Garrett named Bale as author of the latter work, printed in Wesel, "The Resurreccion of the Masse", p. 149

78. "Therefore a latin absolution, to an English sinner, is as good, as a shulder of mutten for a sycke

horsse." A Dialogue or Familiar talke ("Roane" (London?): 1554), Sig.s B5v-B6. Other tracts to propagate doctrine included Thomas Sampson's A letter to the trew professors of Christes Gospell ("Strasburgh" (Wesel): 1554) and Thomas Becon's A humble supplicacion unto God ("Strasburgh" (Wesel): 1554).

79. An Epistle of the Ladye Jane a righte vertuous woman ("Roane" (London?): 1554) and Here in this booke ye have a godly Epistle made by a faithful Christian (London?: 1554). The latter work contains a prayer by John Knox. The account of the convocation debate was by John Philpot, The trew report of the dysputacyon (Emden: 1554), and Expositio disputationis ("Romae" (Cologne): 1554).
80. John Foxe, Commentarii rerum in ecclesia gestarum (Strasbourg: 1554).
81. Becon, A humble supplicacyon unto God, Sig. A7.
82. Knox, Faythfull admonition...unto the professours, (London?: 1554), Sig. E4v.
83. Bale, Excellent Meditation, Sig. B2v and B1.
84. Knox, Faythful admonition...unto the professours, Sigs. E3v and E4v.
85. L.P. Fairfield, "The Mysterious Press", p. 228, attributes this "Woode" tract, dated 11 May, 1554, to Bishop John Hooper.
86. Becon, A confortable Epistle, Sig. A3v and B5.
87. Whitney R.D. Jones, The Tudor Commonwealth 1529-1559,

p. 42. Becon, Lever, Ponet and Robert Crowley were among exiles who had been concerned about Edwardian economic and social abuses.

88. John Knox, A godly letter sent too the fayethfull ("Rome" (Wesel): 1554), Sig. B5. This tract printed in July is a second edition of his May pamphlet An Admonition or warning.

89. William Turner, The Huntyng of the Romyshe Wolfe (Emden: 1554). Turner had earlier written other works against Gardiner and like-minded clergy entitled The huntyng...of the Romishe fox, 1543, and The rescuynge of the Romishe fox, 1545.

90. Turner, Wolfe, Sigs. E6v-F3.

91. Ibid., Sig. F4.

92. Knox, Faythfull admonition...unto the professours, Sigs. E2v-E3. He had earlier characterized her as "a woman of a stoute stomack, more styffe in opynion, then flexible too the truthe, who in no wyse maye abyde the presens of Gods prophetes." A godly letter sent too the fayethfull, Sig. B4v.

93. Hooper, A soveraigne Cordial For a Christian Conscience, Sig. B2.

94. This, of course, includes tracts actually advocating resistance though the discussion that follows is concerned primarily with those works which do not fall in that category. 1555 saw the publication of three resistance tracts. The first was Certayne Questions Demaunded and asked by the Noble Realme

of Englande (Wesel: 1555), the earliest such work written entirely by an Englishman. It was followed by an English translation, attributed to Thomas Becon, of Peter Martyr's Strasbourg lectures on the Book of Judges entitled A Treatise of the Cohabitacion of the faithful and the Unfaithful (Strasbourg: 1555), and A Warnyng for Englande (Emden: 1555).

95. A Supplicacyon to the queenes majestie ("London" (Strasbourg): 1555). There is much to suggest that John Ponet was the author of this tract. Ponet's well-known preoccupation with the question of clerical celibacy (books of his on the subject were published under Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth), is reflected in the Supplicacyon, f. 7. Both this book and Ponet's Apologie attack Dr. Thomas Martin and both make sport of his title, Doctor of Laws -- the Supplicacyon dubs him "doctor of lies", and the Apologie notes it with "as of himself he saieth". John Cawood is also derided in both books. In the Supplicacyon he is made to be the printer of a seditious tract while in the Apologie, p. 148, Cawood is described as one of those "that prynt they care not what, as they may gaine never so little, though it be horrible blasphemy against God and his Aungels." Both mention the heresy of that obscure sect, the Helchesites, Supplicacyon, f. 20v, and Apologie, p. 106. This work and another by Ponet both suggest that Bishop Gardiner, who had

a rival claim to the see of Winchester, merited execution. Supplicacyon, f. 23-23v, and Shorte Treatise of Politicke Power (Strasbourg: 1556), Sig. I4v. Both these works tell a similar story in the first-person. Shortly after Mary's accession, Ponet says he was approached by a fellow bishop who attempted to win him over "to the Quenes procedinges". "Tushe (saied he) thou art a foole: If the Turke ruled in England, I wold frame mi self to live according." Short Treatise, Sigs. L6v-L7. In the Supplicacyon, f. 20, this is rendered as: "I do know some of the bisshops my selff that have said that yf they were in Turkie among the Turks, wold do as they doe, rather then to be in the troble therfore." Finally Bale's Scriptorum Illustrium, p. 694, lists among Ponet's works Ad Reginam interrogationes, a work which Bale apparently did not have at hand (he omitted listing an incipit), and whose English title might approximate A Supplicacyon to the quenes majestie.

96. Supplicacyon, ff. 8v-10v, quotes directly from the 1553 Protestant translation of De Vera Obedentia.

97. Ibid., f. 19. The gentlemen were reminded that the Council of Constance had decided that promises need not be kept with heretics. The resistance tract Certayne Questions used another argument, reasoning "such as have any free holde coppe holdes, or indentureholdes of Abby lands, shall be forced to yelde them up agayne...seynge that the next Pope

may undoe al graunts made to the contrary by his predecessour." Sig. A5v.

98. Supplicacyon, f. 23v. This tract was the first of several works to applaud the 1554 rebellion. Jennifer Loach's claim, in Pamphlets and Politica", p. 43, that the praise given by several resistance tracts to Wyatt "contrasts strongly with that of the majority of writers" cannot be substantiated and rests partly on her misreading of another 1555 tract, An exhortacion to the carienge of Chrystes crosse (Wesel: 1555), p. 43. Loach believes that the leader, mentioned here, who opposed Mary but "purposed never to have furthered the gospel" was Wyatt but, in fact, this criticism was aimed at the Duke of Northumberland, a favourite target of exile writers. Though some pamphleteers espoused a view of passive disobedience and had misgivings about rebellion none ever criticized Wyatt.

99. Physik, dated March 1555, is, despite its claim to have been printed "at Rome by the Vatican church", attributed to the Van Der Erve press at Emden. Turner was himself a physician and botanist as well as pamphleteer.

100. No complete copy of this tract exists and we know of its title only through Andrew Maunsell's Catalogue of English Printed Bookes (London: 1595), p. 64, where it appears as "Wm Keth...His seeing glasse, sent to the nobles and Gentlemen of England,

whereunto is added the praier of Daniell in meeter."

101. Kethe assumed that his readership was familiar with similar warnings and refers to Horne's Apologie, De Vera Obedentia, and Bale's pre-Marian works on Sit John Oldcastle, and King John.

102. Physik, ff. 83-88v. Turner's distaste for the new nobility is not unique in exile literature. A Trewe Mirrour of 1556 apoke against mean-born councillors who ought not to be accounted noble. Sig. B1v.

103. An exhortacion to the carienge of Chrystes crosse, f. 47. Coverdale produced three other works in 1555, The hope of the faythful, A spiritual pearl, and The true justification, all counselling true doctrine and patience, and all published at Wesel.

104. Robert Pownell, The Temporysour (that is to saye: the observer of tyme or he that chaungeth with the tyme) (Wesel: 1555), Sig. A2v. Pownall translated this tract from a French translation by Valerand Poullain of the original work of Wolfgang Musculus.

105. John Scory, An Epistle...unto all the faythfull that be in pryson in Englande (Emden: 1555), Sig. A8 - A8v.

106. In commenting on Ponet's Apologie, Paul Little, in his unpublished 1972 Edinburgh dissertation "The Origins of the Political Ideologies of John Knox and the Marian Exiles", contrasts the treatment accorded to Queen Mary by Ponet in this tract and in his 1556 resistance tract Short Treatise.

The former is termed unctuous and one that protected and praised the Queen, while the latter vilified her. "In no other writer", he concludes, (pp. 217-18), "did a fabric of subservience collapse so quickly or so dramatically". This is rather wide of the mark and misjudges the extent to which exile writers, and Ponet especially, made use of irony when dealing with Mary. For example, Ponet did not complain of Martin's "ungodly and unchast beastlynes and raylinge" (Martin had used terms like "stinkinge lechory" and "beastly bichery"), because he truly wished to protect the Queen from foul language. It was done in order that he might conclude that, as no one could think that Mary could possibly read Martin's book without blushing, the work had gone unread by the Queen, to whom it was dedicated. Apologie, pp. 12-15. Later Ponet accuses Martin of making Henry VIII appear a heretic, and his body thus subject to a posthumous burning. He chides Martin for not covering up these faults of Henry's, lest the world see that Mary allowed her dead father to be maligned. This is a device, not to protect the Queen's good name, but to allow Ponet to bait Mary by noting, "there is no spark, nether of Gods spirite, neither of good nature in those children, which are not greved to here, there dead parents evell reported, and there faults reveled." Ibid., p. 173. This is subversion, not subservience,

and is in the same vein as similar comments in the Shorte Treatise.

107. Becon, ("Gracious Menewe"), A Confutacion of that Popishe and Antichristian doctryne and A plaine subversyon...of auricular confession, both (Wesel: 1555); Cottesford, The accompt rekenynge and confession of the faith of Huldrick Zwinglius ("Geneva" (Emden): 1555); John Olde The acquital... of the moost catholyke Christen Prince, Edwarde the VI ("Waterford" (Emden): 1555).

108. Both were printed by Jean Crespin at Geneva. William Whittingham was the leader of the Genevans in this campaign.

109. Psalmes in metre; The Catechisme...(of)...John Calvin; A Treatyse of election and reprobacion; Certen godly, learned and comfortable conferences and De Coena Dominica.

110. John Olde translated Rudolph Gualter's Antichrist ("Southwark" (Emden): 1555) and produced his own A short description of Antichrist unto the Nobilitie of England, and Confession both (Emden: 1556). John Scory's Two bokes of...S. Augustine (Emden: 1556), on free-will shows that exiles were interested in attacking Anabaptist errors of doctrine as well as those of their Catholic opponents. Robert Watson, who had preached to Ket's rebels in 1549, wrote a treatise on the Eucharist, Aetiologia de transubstantione (Emden: 1556). Ponet's 1555 Apologie for married priests was reprinted, only

very slightly revised, at Strasbourg. Anonymous works on doctrine include An Anatomi of the Masse (Strasbourg: 1556), a translation of Agostino's Mainardo's 1552 Anatomia della messa, and A trewe mirrour or Glase wherein we maye beholde the wofull state of thys our Realme of England (Wesel: 1556), once dubiously attributed to Laurence Saunders.

111. Three recent works deal with this tradition in sixteenth-century England and discuss the contributions of the Marian exiles: Katharine R. Frith, The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530-1645 (Oxford: 1979); Paul Christianson, Reformers and Babylon (Toronto: 1978); and Richard Bauckham, Tudor Apocalypse (Appleford: 1978).

112. Printed originally by Oporinus, for whom Foxe worked as a proofreader, in 1556, the work has been recently translated into English in John Hazel Smith, Two Latin Comedies by John Foxe the Martyrologist, (Ithaca, N.Y.: 1973). The work includes comment by fellow exile Laurence Humphrey.

113. Smith, Two Latin Comedies, p. 345 n.2.

114. In May 1555 Grindal at Frankfurt wrote to the imprisoned Ridley to tell him of the state of the dispersed churches and to inform him that his treatise against transubstantiation had been read by the exiles. He told Ridley that it had been decided not to print these writings "till we see what God will do with you, both for incensing of their malicious fury, and also for restraining you

and others from writing hereafter." Grindal, ed. William Nicholson, pp. 239-40. The deaths of the Oxford martyrs meant that their works could be printed with impunity. It should be noted though that Knox had included a Ridley piece in one of his early 1554 works.

115. The former, edited by "E.P.", was a product of the Lamprecht press at Wesel, the latter of the Van Der Erve press at Emden.

116. Grindal wrote to Foxe in August 1556 about this work in the belief that the material should be corrected. Philpot had, apparently, made verbal slips because he had had no books in his imprisonment. Peter Martyr and Bullinger also wished the same might be done with Hooper's writings, composed hurriedly in prison. Grindal therefore asked Foxe that, if he used the material, he could add a critical note, Grindal, p. 223.

117. Though martyrdom was a recommended course of action for those at home, the exile John Olde remarked that it was easier to say how wonderful a fate it was, than to suffer it. Though suffering, he noted, was said to be glorious it was nonetheless "very harde for the cowardly fleshe to beleve it, or to think on it, whan the very pynce of trouble and persecucion cometh." A confession of the...olde belefe ("Sothewarke" (Emden): 1556), Sig. D5v. Olde went on to apologize for his own weakness and flight.

118. Resistance tracts of 1556 were Ponet's Shorte Treatise of Politike Power, John Bradford's Copye of a letter, sent by John Bradforthe (Antwerp: 1556), the only surviving literary effort of those exiles based in France, and the anti-clerical A Copye of a verye fyne and wytty letter sent from the ryght Reverende Lewes Lippomanus (Emden and London (?): 1556), mischievously attributed to Michael Throckmorton.

119. Theophilus is the Protestant figure and Eusebius the Catholic -- these names themselves reflecting the irenic and moderate tone of the work. In Werdmueller's Temporysour, also a dialogue, Eusebius "according to the signification of hys name occupieth the place of a faythful Christian", with "Temporisor", "Irenius", and "Mondayn" as his opponents.

120. Trewe Mirrour, Sig. B4v.

121. Ibid. Sigs. B2-B3. The charge against the Queen of breaking her father's will was a very serious one as many felt that it was this document which provided her main claim to the succession.

122. William Whittingham, ed., Conferences betwene... Rydley...and Latimer (Emden: 1556), f. 24. Latimer concluded that "he that canne not dissemble, can not rule."

123. Thomas Lever, A Treatise of the right way from Danger of Sinne (London: 1575), Sigs. F4v-F5. This citation is from an Elizabethan reprint of the 1556 original first published in Geneva.

124. Olde, A short description of Antichrist, f. 39v.

125. Ibid., f. 43v.

126. Cranmer, Confutacion, Sig. C5 and C1.

127. Lever, A Treatise of the right way, Sig. G7. This triumph of Mary over Queen Jane and Northumberland had provided loyalist writers with the theme of miraculous intervention, e.g., John Elder's The Copie of a letter sent in the Scotlande (London: 1555), and the ballad by "T.W.", A ninvectvye agaynst Treason (London: 1553).

128. Johnson, "English Books Printed Abroad", p. 276. It is interesting to note that after its solitary production in 1557 the Rihel press also ceased printing exile books.

129. A.F. Johnson, and V. Scholderer, Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in the Netherlands and Belgium (London: 1965), p. 229.

130. Josef Benzing, Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts (Wiesbaden: 1963), p. 450. Hugh Singleton, the printer associated with Lamprecht in exile book production in Wesel, is found in Strasbourg in 1557 petitioning for residency rights. Garrett, The Marian Exiles, pp. 289 and 370.

131. This was accomplished when they secured the services of Pieter de Zuttere at Wesel and at least one other unidentified printer of undefined location who was responsible for The Lamentacion of England (np: 1557), one of the year's resistance tracts.

132. There appears also to have been a simultaneous

decrease in the numbers of loyalist books printed in England. Loades, The Reign of Mary Tudor, p. 341, tentatively blames this phenomenon on "the hardships caused by war, dearth, and sickness."

133. Two resistance tracts appeared in 1557, Robert Powroll's Admonition to Callays (Wesel: 1557), and the anonymous Lamentacion of England, which contained a declaration by Thomas Cranmer.

134. The Newe Testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ (Geneva: 1557). The work, a revision of Tyndale's translation, was printed by Conrad Badius and also included a prefatory epistle by Jean Calvin. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. VIII, p. 529 tells how in 1558 the English Protestant William Living complained of ill treatment by the authorities and the loss of property including "a New Testament of Geneva".

135. Fox, Supplicatio, p. 65, makes mention of Turner's thoughts in this regard.

136. Perhaps as many as eight editions of resistance tracts were published in 1558 outnumbering three doctrinal works by Bartholomew Traheron, an attack on the papcy by John Bale and another edition of the Forme of Prayers by William Whittingham.

137. The Genevan resistance tracts were Christopher Goodman's How Superior Powers ought to be Obeyd, with additional material by William Whittingham and William Kethe, and three works by John Knox, The First Blast of the Trumpet, a revised Lettre to the Regent and The Appellation of John Knox, with

additional material by Anthony Gilby and William Kethe. Bartholomew Traheron at Wesel contributed to the body of tracts approving of resistance with his pseudonymous A Warning to England To Repent. The location of the anonymous author of The Lamentacion, twice republished in an expanded form in 1558, remains a mystery.

138. Of the 109 Marian Protestant tracts which survive, 66 (roughly 60%) are by authors sympathetic to resistance theory.

CHAPTER III: THE RESISTANCE THEORY OF THE MARIAN EXILES

In the spring of 1554 the rebellion led by Thomas Wyatt had been crushed by forces loyal to the Queen but opposition to Mary continued to manifest itself. Orders were given for the destruction of seditious bills, and a number of writers were arrested,[1] but such writings continued to appear in the streets of London. Some urged a new rising, some spoke in favour of the claims of Princess Elizabeth, and others talked of keeping the Prince of Spain from entering England.[2] In France, exiled English nobles and adventurers continued to plot the overthrow of Queen Mary. Based at Rouen men like Sir Peter Carew, a veteran of Wyatt's Rebellion, drew up plans for an invasion of the south coast of England.[3] At the same time Sir Thomas Stafford, with two associates, visited his uncle Cardinal Pole "and uttered seditious words about the Queen and his Highness's marriage, saying that all good Englishmen ought to take up arms and prevent the Spaniards from entering the country."[4]

A faythfull admonycion

This tension, partly religious and partly xenophobic, was maintained by the start of deprivation action against Protestant clergy, the heresy proceedings against Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, the continued trials of rebels and a spring Parliament concerned

with the Spanish marriage and the religious settlement. In such a situation it was essential that the exiled Protestant clergy make a comprehensive statement on the question of obedience to the Marian regime. This was done by one such exile, most probably John Bale, with the publication of A faythfull admonycion of a certen trewe pastor in May 1554.[5]

Though Bale was reluctant to name his source, styling him only "a worthy prophet as hath bene sins the Apostles tyme",[6] the work is a translation of one of Martin Luther's earliest statements on resistance, the Warning to his Dear German People[7] of 1531. To this Bale added a preface by Melanchthon which had accompanied the editions of Warning published in 1546 and a preface of his own under the pseudonym "Eusebius Pamphilus". Luther's original justification for resistance, made in 1531, had been amended in the edition of 1546 to make the arguments bolder and less equivocal. Bale, taking this version, also made amendments, omitting certain direct references to events of 1531, and adding statements of his own to Luther's text.

Luther's advocacy of violent resistance to the Emperor and the Catholic German princes was based on the legitimacy of self-defence, a theme on which Bale's translation elaborated. The Protestants, the tract claimed, had asked only for freedom of the gospel but their enemies seemed to be determined to use force against God's truth and the lawful, ancient

privileges of England.[8] Though they had been diligently taught the dangers of sedition by their preachers, Protestants would resist this oppression. They could do this in safe conscience because they knew "it is a nother thing to be a rebell, than to be one off thos which stand in the defence of gods trewe religion, and of their natural contrie".[9] Opposition to those who sought to bring in foreigners to rule and subvert the country's ancient privileges, and the defence of "the common sort" was lawful and not to be termed rebellion.[10] This, according to a statement made by Luther and retained by Bale, was demonstrable by law, and lawyers could not deny it.

Having asserted the legitimacy of self-defence, a term which embraced opposition to foreign usurpation and unspecified "wicked practises and unlawfull proceedings of blood suppers Papistes", the tract turned to reasons why princes or Emperor were not to be obeyed in actions against God. The first reason was the oath made at all Christian baptisms to uphold the gospel. Obedience to the Emperor was conditional on his adherence to this oath. Should he break his vow his subjects need not obey him.[11] The second reason was that no man should partake in the filthy living and abominations of papistry, a lengthy catalogue of which included the usual Protestant objections to the mass, pilgrimages, veneration of saints, papal interference in secular matters, etc.[12] Finally, to render obedience where

it ought not to be given, in this case to Catholic authorities, would be to aid the destruction of everything that was good -- true religion and country. Should the papists triumph all classes of Englishman, nobles, yeomen and commons alike, would be disinherited and destroyed. Aliens would ravish English women, steal English land, and set up new laws for old.[13]

This section of the Faythfull admonycion, drawn from Luther, ends with the reassertion that the resistance advocated is strictly in the nature of self-defence and that Protestants were not being stirred to uproar or sedition. However, the tract states, "iff thei shuld be forced by violence to the obedience of such unlawful things...thei may be all lawes defend themselves against such Magistrates, even as against most violent tyrannes and bloodhowndes".[14] Luther's justification resistance had included a warning to his foes that "God can stirre up a Judas Machabeus to be the capten of his flock which shall beate them downe, and teach them to be auctors of warre whan thei may have peace".[15] It was the message of the Melanchthon preface, which Bale included, that the present crisis facing Protestants much resembled that facing those second-century B.C. religious rebels, the Maccabees, who had responded by a national rising against foreign idolaters and native collaborators. The tract suggested that "every one may take good and profitable instructions owt of the same bokes and story."

The preface defended this call to resistance by echoing Luther's view of true religion under attack from the papacy and aliens. Not only would idolatry replace right worship but Spaniards, that "most vyle and beastly peple gevyn to vice and brutisshnes", would displace natives from their positions. These actions might lawfully be disobeyed by "the inferior sort" as their obligations to God forbade the maintenance of idolatry. Moreover the magistrates had no authority to enforce such actions against God as "the regiment of the comon welth is such an ordinance of god wherin the Magistrate hath his appoynted bowndes as wel as the subject".[16]

The examples given of legitimate disobedience ranged from the non-violent to assassination. Obadiah was commended for disobeying his king and hiding the prophets who were to have been slain[17] and the resistance by the Armenians to Emperor Maximian in the cause of their religion and country was likewise praised. Two examples of individual killings were also included, one, of a viceroy, in self-defence and one, of a military officer, in defence of an abused wife. Though these examples were drawn from the Old Testament or antiquity it was the verdict of this tract that such examples "in christen men are right and lawful and doo please god well. Yea thei are speciall testimonies of the judgement of god against unlawfull violence and intollerable pryde and presumpcion of tyrannes."[18] The definition of tyranny which followed

was somewhat broader than the examples would suggest. It was, for example, tyranny to bring in idolatry, to separate godly men from their wives, or to bring in foreigners to subvert the commonwealth. Such tyranny was to be opposed by every man in his own degree in defence of true religion, and one's native country with its ancient privileges.

Bale's own preface drew the attention of Englishmen to the similarity of the threat once posed to German Protestantism and that now facing England. Unless the warning given by the tract was heeded the result would be a nation enslaved by alien tyrants and a people seduced by false religion. Bale's explanation of the cause of his country's plight was that of other exile tract writers -- sin and unthankfulness manifested under Edward and continued under Mary. Along with these other writers Bale laid the blame chiefly on the nobility whose indolence and supine dissoluteness "without dowt hath bene a great cause of this plage that is now comme up on us".[19] In what must be a reference to the fate of the Duke of Northumberland, Bale pointed out that the nobility had been warned of their enormities and that God had now taught some of them the price of hypocrisy in matters of religion. Repentance was now to be the order of the day with the nobility refusing to deny God's word and not, as Bale put it in a phrase foreshadowing other exile slights on woman's rule, "to seme to feare more a weake creature (As Peter did the gyrle) than the

mighty god".[20]

The repentance Bale had in mind for the nation was, as it was to be for other advocates of resistance, an active one involving a change of heart and vigorous action as well. However, like Luther, he was anxious to phrase his appeal in terms of its legality. The following passage demonstrates this and shows how Bale achieves the transition from a call for disobedience into one for active resistance:

> And specially let no man misconstrew it, but reade it with judgement as an instruccion not to stirre any man to unlawful rebellion (as I dowt not but the papistes gods sworne adversaries will be redy to say, where as thei and no nother are the auctors of all myschefe, as may most manifestly appeare to any that hath but half his right witt) but only as an advertysement that no man minister any aide or obedience to such tyrannes as bend themselves against god and his word and to the subversion of their natural contry. In which case it is not only unlawful to obey them or in any wyse to consent unto them, but also most lawfull to stand in the defence of goddes religion and of the lawdable and awncient state of their contry against suoh uncircumcised tyrannes (thei shall never be called magistrates of me til thei shewe them selves worthy of that name) as goo abowt such devillissh enterprises. The god of heaven with his mighty hand confownd them.[21]

There are several important things to be noted of this, the first of all Marian resistance tracts. One is the fact that the work is not at all specific about who may carry out the resistance. Luther's original Warning was meant to justify action by sympathetic German princes and the dominant theme in Continental Protestant resistance writings was, as we have seen, the appeal to the inferior magistracy. Bale, certainly aware of this theory, was also aware of its inapplicability to the English situation.

The nobility, who had been accused of being mere lip-gospellers under Edward, were, many of them, overt supporters of the return to Rome. Erstwhile adherents of the Protestant usurper Queen Jane had turned against her in a twinkling and even her father-in-law Northumberland, once the patron of Hooper and Knox, had died abjuring Protestantism. The, at best, lukewarm support accorded Wyatt by the landed classes had demonstrated to the clerical exiles the futility of an appeal to the nobility. However, exile thought had not yet reached a stage where the rights of the whole people or a righteous tyrannicide could be stressed. Bale's appeal is then studiously vague, asking the reader of his work only, "let it be your endeavour that it be not written or translated in vain". His hope is not to awaken a particular class to its responsibilities but rather to educate the entire nation in the legality of resistance that, should an opportunity, or a Judas Maccabee, arise, the population could then heed Bale's advice. This desire to appeal to the whole nation can be seen in Bale's attempt to widen the threat that he, Melanchthon, and Luther described from one directed against Protestantism only, to one which menaced the country, its laws, privileges and inhabitants. Thus the Spaniards are described as "the most vyle and godles nacion upon the earth" intent on the destruction of Englishmen and their posterity, and the overall xenophobic content of the original German tract is greatly enhanced.

This display of nationalism on Bale's part raises another interesting issue, that of the "alienated" exile and resistance theory.[22] Far from evincing alienation it is clear that Bale bases a great deal of his call to violent action on a close affinity to, rather than an alienation from, his country and its institutions. He urges the defence of "the lawdable and awncient state" of his natural country and "its ancient privileges", a defence which he links to that of true religion. Though Bale speaks more boldly than he might have in England, and calls for national repentance, this is a long way from being a revolutionary figure fundamentally estranged from his native land. It seems that, in its beginnings at any rate, the resistance theory of the Marian exiles was not a function of any alienation.

Throughout 1554 the plight of England's Protestants grew worse. The arrival of the Spaniards, which some had hoped would prompt an uprising, was carried off with little difficulty, and the Queen, amid rejoicing, married her Spanish prince. By the autumn Mary was rumoured to be pregnant with a child that would be three-fourths Spanish and the Catholic heir to the throne. Protestant clergy continued to be held in prison. Worst of all, Reginald Pole returned to become papal legate, the November Parliament achieved a reconciliation with the Church of Rome, and medieval heresy laws were revived.[23]

Tension in the country, however, continued at a

high level. Seditious writings still appeared despite numerous arrests and the destruction of John Day's printing operation.[24] Conspiracy and assassination plots were in the air while a visible manifestation of the popular distaste for Spaniards took the shape of overt hostility and violence.[25]

Certayne Questions

The exiles responded to the situation by increasing the flow of their tract literature into England, a stream of works which included two advocating resistance. From Strasbourg, after Day's capture, came another issue of Bale's Faythfull admonycion, differing from the original only in its marginalia, and from Wesel, early in 1555, issued one of the most interesting and undervalued tracts of the exile, Certayne Questions Demaunded and asked by the Noble Realme of Englande, of her true naturall chyldren and Subjectes of the same.[26] Framed as a seried of forty-eight questions, Certayne Questions tells us, more than any other tract, of political realities as perceived by the exiles. It is a work concerned with recent events, the Queen's marriage and pregnancy, Parliamentary bills, trials and imprisonments, and their implications for the future of the country and its religion.

The tract, fiercely nationalistic and equally Protestant, is radical in both its diagnosis and proposed remedies as it explores themes which succeeding resistance tracts were to take up in their time.

To the author two things were to be feared, the destruction of Protestantism in England and the nation's subjugation by Spain. The principal villain who sought both ends was the Queen and it was the aim of the tract to destroy her authority. Since Mary had relied on Parliament and its statute law to achieve the restoration of Catholicism, and might use the same body to help further the Spanish cause, Certayne Questions also directed fire on it and its members.

The attack on Mary's authority to rule was twofold, with the Queen assailed as both usurper and tyrant. Striking at the basis of her claim to the throne the tract asked:

> Item, whether the Princes be worthy to be hyr fathers eyre (who onely by his last wil called hyr unto) wyll not observe hyr fathers wil, and whether of right her fathers wyl ought to prevayle agaynst all her practyses, contrary to the same wyll, or not? and what judgement shall folowe that Princes which doth the contrary? [27]

Since Mary's succession rested, in large part, on Henry VIII's will, a document that specified that failure to keep its conditions would result in forfeiture of the crown,[28] any suggestion that Mary was violating its terms would be extremely telling. Though this question did not specify how the Queen had defied her father's will it seems most probable that this argument was based on the provision that she not marry without the consent of those councillors Henry had appointed to serve Edward. The implications of lack of consent (though, interestingly, not the consent of the Council) are spelled out later when the

question is posed: "whether a Quene beyng desyred by the whole lower house of Parliament to marry within the realme, and to no straunger, oughte to be obeyed, yf she doe to the contrarye to her poore commons?"[29]

By the will of Henry VIII, failure to observe its conditions meant that the succession would revert to Elizabeth. Yet Certayne Questions, which pointed out Mary's violation of that will, seems, in another question, to object to Mary's claim to the throne in terms which would also bar Elizabeth from the succession.

> Item whether the expres word of god in the xxii. Chapter of Deuteronomy forbyd a woman to beare a sworde, or weare spurs, as kyngs do in theyr creacion, or to weare any other weapon, or apparell of a man, saying: A woman shal not weare the weapons of a man, neyther shall a man put on womans rayment, for who so doeth it, is abhominacion unto the Lord God.[30]

Though this particular evocation of the law of Moses seems to be a new one, English Protestant objections to woman's rule had already been voiced under Edward.[31] Fears about the legal position of a queen regnant were taken seriously enough by Mary's government to have prompted a bill in the first Parliament of 1554 "declaring that the Rgall Power of this Realme is in the Quenes Majestie as fully and absolutely as ever it was in any of her most noble progenitors Kinges of this Realme." The bill insisted that the "Kingly or regal office" was invested either in male or female, "any custom, use, or scruple, or any other thing whatsoever to be made to the contrary notwithstanding."[32]

There is another attack on the Queen which might

also be considered to impugn her right to rule. This is the charge, often repeated by the exile tract writers, that Mary was a bastard. While the rules governing royal succession seem to differ from the common law which discriminated against illegitimate children (they were, for example barred from succeeding to a noble title), the author of Certayne Questions may have felt that the taint of bastardy was so strong, especially in combination with accusations of usurpation, as to cast doubts on Mary's claim to the throne.[33] He pointed out, in two questions, that Mary had been deemed illegitimate by no less than "xiii of the greatest and best scoles or universities in al Christendom and by the whole body of the Canon law" and that her Chancellor had, at one time, agreed.[34] Any subsequent legitimation could only be performed by the Pope and such a move would be invalid as his power had been renounced by England.

Having laid Mary's claim to rule open to question on the grounds that, as a woman, a bastard and one who violated the conditions of royal succession, the Queen was a usurper, the tract also sought to label her a tyrant, "ex parte exercitii". This was initiated by asking the question "whether a kyng becometh a tyraunt, in folowing his wyll, and forsaking his law".[35] This is followed by a series of questions designed to show that Mary had, in fact, placed her will above the law. Referring to the continued imprisonment of Princess Elizabeth, Certayne Questions asked "whether

it be tyrannie for a Prince, to kepe his brother or sister in pryson, and can charge them with nothinge as all the Realme well knoweth."[36] The tract then cited the infamous case of Nicholas Throgmorton in 1554 where Mary's government had acted against the jury who had acquitted a defendant in the trials of Wyatt conspirators:

> Item, whether the Kynge thursteth the bloud of his subjectes, when he seketh meanes to put his subjectes to death, after he is lawfully quyte by the lawes of his Realme, and punished those men, who have passed upon hys lyfe, forcing them as much as may be to kyl his sayd subjecte." [37]

More acts of tyranny were imputed to Mary in attributing to her the unjust death sentences against Archbishop Cranmer and Lady Jane Grey. The former was said to have been tried by men clearly more guilty than he and convicted, not for any crime of treason, but "because he would not assent to them in religion."[38] Jane Grey's death was called tyrannous because it was said to have been prompted not by any fault of her own doing but by the Queen's desire that Jane not be left alive to succeed her.[39] Mary was also accused of "oppression and extorcion" in seizing the property of her opponents who fled the country.[40]

Not content to stop at labelling Mary a usurper and a tyrant for her violation of the law in the robbery, false imprisonment, and murder of innocent victims, the author of Certayne Questions also sought to portray Mary as a traitor to the realm. This treachery showed itself in her desire to see Spaniards hold sway in England and in her plans for diminution

of the realm. Asserting, in the tract's first question, that treason to the realm and treason to its ruler were two different things, the author made a fundamental distinction that was to prove of great worth to the exile's resistance writers. He protested that Mary, though Queen of England, would be guilty of betraying her own realm if she were to attempt to "deliver up unto another farren Prince, the right title tuition, and defence of [her realme, without the consent of [her] lawfull eyre or eyres apparent and faythful subjectes."[41] This claim that Englishmen possessed a stake in their realm was reasserted when it was asked "whether the Realme of England belong to the Quene, or to her subjectes?", a question followed by several more to show that the Queen could neither sell the realm, nor give it away, nor even marry "without the consent of her commons".[42] Mary's capacity for giving away her realm was feared to extend beyond a mere title and Certayne Questions protested against a ruler who sought to hand over to the hateful Spaniard the lands, goods, and families of all her subjects.[43]

The tract made great appeal to English xenophonic sentiment. Spaniards, who had caused other nations to regret their presence,[44] would force poor Englishmen to pay Philip's debts and other "importable taxes", make themselves free with the commodities of the realm and destroy the native nobility.[45] In these practices Mary would aid them.

Despite his use of the kingly title Philip felt

that his position in England would be strengthened by a formal coronation and he had impressed this desire on Mary who found herself unable to oblige her husband due to the strength of opposition in the country to such a plan.[46] Certayne Questions drew attention to the intensity of Philip's desire for the crown despite protestations to the contrary. It suggested, in three questions, that Philip would not hesitate to perjure himself to win the crown and, failing this, eventually turn to open warfare.

> Item, whether such a Prince missing of his purpose by intreaty and fayre meanes, oughte not to be feared having foreyne power within the Realme at his commaundement, which increaseth dayly, and the favoure of the Quene, least he wyll attempte to obtayne that thing by conquest which otherwyse by intreatye he can not obtayne, from which miserye I beseche almighte God save England.[47]

A further onslaught on the legitimacy of the Marian regime took the form of an attack on the legality of the King and Queen's marriage and on their expected offspring.

> Item, whether a King beyng betroughted to another Kynges doughter, with wordes of the present tyme, may marry another woman or not, she beynge a lyve? And yf suche a Prince should marry with the Quene of Englande, whether should she lyve in adoutry, and the childe childe [sic] so begotten, then be a bastarde or not? [48]

Thinking that it was not enough to brand Philip and Mary's heir as the bastard of a bastard, Certayne Questions advanced the proposition that the royal child might not be product of their union at all.

> Item, Herry the fowrth Emperour married with Constancia, the eyre and Quene of Napels, and by her entitled Kinge of Napels, yf because of her yeares beyng before a Nunne virgine disparyng of lawfull issue, practysed with his Phisicion, having a wife, which lately

> conceaved to brute according to the tyme of her concepcion, a lyke concepcion of the Quene: and so in thend brought forth the Phisicions child, as the Quenes: whereby the inharitaunce of the realme was transported to a villayn, whether it is impossible, there might be agayne any such lyke practyse? [49]

Having undermined the legitimacy of Mary's claim to the throne, her marriage and her hope for an unchallanged succession, the author of Certayne Questions now turned on Parliament as that institution through which Mary had sought to achieve those ends that the tract opposed -- a Catholic religious settlement and Spanish domination of England. The objections to Parliament covered much ground. Their claim to speak for the nation was challenged:

> Item, whether these men be mete to sytte in the Parliament house, that wil not speak as readily and as earnestly for the profyte of the poore man, and wealth of the realme, as for the pleasure and flattering of his Prince, or not? [50]

As for the House of Lords:

> Item, yf this word noble, be as much to saye as notable: whether the notable wyse, or the notable fooles of a realme are to be called nobles, and whether of theyr consentes, is to be taken for the consent of the nobilitie. [51]

Parliament was further assailed by the claim that Mary's Parliaments were "parcial...chosen by craft and pollicy, for the compassing of the Princes wilful purpose", and were composed of men who had committed perjury in violating their oaths.[52] Moreover, these men were ignorant in affairs of religion and emperilled the souls of everyone in the realm when they dealt with spiritual matters.[53] The tract was also prepared to argue that the entire reconciliation with the Church of Rome, tortuously arrived at and

long sought by the Queen, rested on a foundation of Parliamentary illegality. Certayne Questions asked "whether the Bishop of Romes auctoritie be lawfulley receyved or not agayn into England, for asmuch as the laste Parliamente wherein he was restored was no Parliament, because it is evydente by the olde lawes of the Realme, that the Kynges of England may not kepe two Parliaments in one yeare."[54] The tract also seemed to claim that Parliamentary statute law could not be used to violate the more fundamental law against diminution of the realm, when it protested against a Queen who sought "all meanes possyble to give away the Realme for ever, by Parliament, or otherwise".[55]

If the nation's Parliaments were ignorant and invalid, and the Queen a usurper and a tyrant, what was to be done? If England's ruling classes conspired to endanger the souls of everyone in the realm and sought to deliver the country into the hands of rapacious foreigners, who could stop them? The political situation in England ruled out any recourse to the solution advocated by Continental Reformers, that of an appeal to the estates of the realm or to the nobility acting as inferior magistrates. The course proposed by the author of Certayne Questions mixed a view of English constitutionalism with the natural law doctrine of the legitimacy of self-defence in a call to the people to act against Parliament and the Queen.

The right of the people to act was, in part, grounded in the first two questions the tract posed:

> Whether ther be two kynd of tresones, one to the kynges parsone, and a nother to the body of the relme or not, and whether the boddy of the rellme, may pardon the committed treasone unto the parsone of the prince, and a gayne whether the Prynce may pardon treason done to the body of the relme?
>
> Item whether a Prince can betray his own realme, or not? and whether as the subjectes of a realme without the consent of the Prince may not deliver up the right and title of the same realme (belonging unto the Prince) unto a straunger, whom it belongeth nothing unto: So likewyse the Prince cannot deliver up unto another farren Prince, the right title, tuition and defence, of his realme, without the consent of his lawfull eyre or eyres apparent and faythful subjecte, unto any straunger, without theyr lawfull and expressed consent of them both.[56]

From this welter of questions we can draw two important propositions, that the body of the realm can be betrayed by its ruler and that the people have as large a stake in the disposition of the realm as its lawful heir. Reaffirming, later in the work, the importance of the commons' consent to any disposition, the tract then asks "whether the commons may not lawefully by the lawes of God, and of nature, stand against such a Prince, to depose her which hath and doeth seeke all meanes possyble to geve away the Realme for ever, by Parliament, or otherwise from her right eyres and natural subjectes, to a straunger?"[57] It is the common people then, and not the nobility, who are vested with the responsibility of punishing the treason of a prince seeking unconstitutionally to diminish the realm. Though the tract is willing to warn the nobility of threats to their abbey lands, and of their future under the Spaniards, it is clear

that the author expects no reward from a direct appeal to them.[58]

The belief that as a man might, by natural law, rightfully use violence in self-defence, so too might a nation,[59] validates the recourse to resistance expressed in the question:

> whether subjectes oughte to loke to theyr own safetye, and to the safetie of the realme and to joyne them selfes wholy together, to put downe such a Prince as seketh all meanes possible to deliver them theyr landes, theyr goodes, theyr wyves, theyr children, and the whole realme into the handes of Spanyardes, who be most justly hated lyke dogges all the world over? [60]

Here the emphasis is less on diminution of the realm and more on the threat to the well-being of Englishmen betrayed into the hands of a nation which, as other questions made clear, would invade, pillage, and disinherit the native inhabitants. Again it is the whole people who are urged to join together in an attempt to depose Mary.

It should be noted that Certayne Questions does not attempt to find in the people the nation's ultimate arbiter, with Marsiglian-like powers to depose and replace a ruler at its whim. What it does affirm is that, in England, the people possess a share in the realm and that when a prince seeks to ignore that share and dispossess himself of the realm the people may act, as they may also act in natural self-defence. There is no suggestion that, following a deposition, the people have the right to set up any ruler they choose, as the tract also emphasizes

the stake possessed by the rightful heir.[61] Inspiration for the work would seem to have sprung less from Defensor Pacis or the works of European Protestants, than from a particularly English view of the situation, one that drew its image of tyranny from the nation's chroniclers such as Halle,[62] and which perceived that resistance to a tyrant had to come from the people if it were to come from anywhere.

In many ways Certayne Questions marks an advance in English resistance theory when compared to Bale's Faythfull admonycion.[63] It is a bolder work going beyond Bale's vagueness and reliance on natural law self-defence to place the responsibility for action in the hands of the people should they discover themselves threatened or the realm abused by a tyrant. Certayne Questions is avowedly a product of the English experience, rather than borrowed from the continent. As the prefatory verse declared: "England speaketh to the Englishmen,/ Aunswere these questions and so shal I knowe/ Yf thou wyshe my safte or my overthrowe." It was also an influential work, the first to use concepts which were later to be incorporated into other resistance tracts. The use of Deuteronomy as a source of views on kingship, the appeal to the lessons of English history, the distinction between treason to the Queen and to England, the claim that violations of her father's will made Mary a usurper, and the threat of a substitute child as heir, were all advanced by Certayne Questions before being used by other exiles.

The Cohabitacyon

Though Certayne Questions had declined seeking a remedy for the nation's oppression in appealing to the nobility, there were still those among the exiles prepared to do so in print. This found expression in the 1555 tract A Treatise of the Cohabitacyon of the faithfull with the unfaithfull, published by the Rihel press at Strasbourg. Based on a series of lectures given in that city by the Italian reformer Peter Martyr,[64] it was one of the clearest expositions of the Continental theory of the power of the inferior magistrate to that date.[65] Martyr, who, on the death of Edward, had fled from England where he had been teaching at Oxford, attracted around him a circle of English exile students. To them he spoke of that problem which had beset English Protestantism since the accession of Mary and which in 1555, with the start of the executions for heresy, had become increasingly critical, that of the responsibility of a true Christian surrounded by infidels and idolaters. It was this discussion which, translated by an exile, or perhaps a group of them, emerged as The Cohabitacyon.[66]

The tract examines, in a style that earned Martyr the title of a Protestant scholastic, the problem of whether a Christian might cohabit, that is "be famyliarlie conversaunte, dwell and live together", with unbelievers. The solution of this problem demanded three distinctions, one between magistrates

and subjects, another between strong, learned believers and those who were weak and unlearned, and a final distinction between situations where one was not compelled to idolatry and situations where one was. Those subjects who were strong and learned believers, able to spread the faith, generally were allowed to cohabit in order that the ungodly be won over. The weaker believers were not. However, in a situation where superstitious practices were enforced, no believer might cohabit and the choice was simple: "either flye, or dye for the truthe".[67] No obedience could be rendered to anyone compelling idolatry, be it tyrant, king, queen or bishop.

The responsibilities of magistrates were different from those of subjects, and to illuminate these, other distinctions were necessary. There were, according to The Cohabitacyon, two sorts of rulers: those supreme rulers depending on no other, and under-rulers who hold office beneath them. The absolute rulers must enforce true religion, even to the point of compelling to the faith. As for the inferior magistrates, these were again of two sorts. Those nobles who ranked highly because of their wealth or ancient lineage but who had no jurisdiction, are treated in this regard, as private subjects. Those who bore rule because they were the lieutenants or officers of the chief ruler had responsibilities of their own and it is a discussion of these duties

which leads to an advocacy of the right to resistance.

These inferior magistrates were as responsible as their superiors for the maintenance of true religion. They too must ensure superstition was repressed and the unfaithful were compelled to the faith. They must not obey their superiors if ordered to assist in the spreading of idolatry. This prescribed disobedience may start with reasonable persuasion but armed defense of the faith was allowed[68] by virtue of the share of power which the inferior magistrate holds. Chosen by the superior to be "a parte of theyr Rule, to be theyr helpers in administringe and ordering theyr businesses and charge, to the end that Justice might florishe" the inferior magistrates' resistance is then only fulfillment of their responsibilities.[69] The truth of this proposition could be demonstrated from Scriptural examples. The Maccabees had refused to obey the ungodly commands of their Macedonian overlords and had rebelled against them. This was permissible because they "in dignitie were nexte unto the house and stocke of the Kinges, and bare the chief Rule nexte unto it."[70] The rebellion against Athaliah is also instructive. She had become Queen through violent usurpation but it was not this fact which justified the resistance offered her by the high priest. It was her actions against the true religion which warranted her assassination by the followers of "Joiada the bishopp". The Cohabitacyon

backed up these Biblical warrants for disobedience by citing the Justinian Code where the Emperor was not to be obeyed in any wrong-doing and by the example of Trajan who commanded an inferior officer to slay him if he acted unjustly.[71]

This resistance was strictly limited to those cases where the laws of God were threatened. In civil matters inferior magistrates "may give place to the unjust commaundementes and decrees of theyr hygher Lordes".[72] However the tract despaired of nobles who would eagerly spring to the defence of their own property but would do nothing for the Kingdom of God assailed by tyrants. "Yea when they are required of theyr hygher poures as ministers of theyr furie to destroye and overthrow the gospell then they neyther sturre nor speake anye thing at all, but do as they are bidden. In theyr own cause they can fight and rebell but in Goddes cause they are as it were no princes nor Rulers."[73]

In the light of earlier resistance tracts this may have appeared retrogressive or restrictive.[74] Where the Faythfull admonycion and Certayne Questions allowed grounds of self-defence and constitutional violation in a mixture of Protestantism, patriotism and xenophobia, with the whole people entitled to act, The Cohabitacyon permitted only action by the inferior magistracy in defence of religion. However, despite the English experience with Edwardian lip-gospelling nobles and the accuracy of the tract's pessimistic

conclusions on the zeal of the inferior magistracy, the work must have been welcomed by those exiles favouring resistance. The sanction of Peter Martyr, one of the Reformation's dominant figures, for rebellion on religious grounds, could certainly be applied to the situation in England where the true religion was being openly oppressed. The tract opened up a new problem. If it never stirred any of that nation's magistrates to action it certainly prompted other exile writers to consider the rights of the inferior magistracy.[75]

A Warnyng for Englande

One of the distinguishing features of the three resistance tracts already discussed is the strong element of religious protest they contain. Tyrannous acts against the true religion are castigated and seen as justification for violent action against the higher powers. But one tract written in 1555 abandoned this line of thought and mentions religion only in terms of the resentment of clerical power and the threat to lay ownership of sequestered church lands. The work was entitled A Warnyng for Englande[76] and was an attempt to cut across confessional lines to stir resistance to any plans to crown Philip.

The early autumn of 1555 was marked by hopes and fears concerning the coronation of Philip. The failure of Mary's "pregnancy" brought speculation that

the King, baulked of an heir, was now forced to rely on a formal coronation to achieve the power that he sought in England. It was said that he had left England in order to force the Queen to accede to his demand and attention focussed on the Parliament called for October where it was thought the issue would be debated.[77]

A Warnyng was written to influence opinion on the eve of this Parliament and to dissuade the influential men of England from aiding Philip in his ambitions. The tract's chief tool of persuasion was the story of the experience of other countries, especially Naples under Spanish rule. "If it be trew that the Poet sayeth, Happy is the man that can beware by another mans mischief" then England might profit by the warning.[78] Naples, the reader was told, had come into the hands of the Spaniards through "pretensed titell of marriage" and at first all seemed well, with promises that ancient liberties would be preserved. However, while natives continued to hold office, the Spanish insinuated themselves into positions of power, taking over castles and strong-holds. The country's Lieutenant was provided with a Spanish Co-Lieutenant who soon forced the native to retire. Soon all native-born officers were dismissed and the Spaniards took over completely, to the country's desolation. The nobility were put to death or disinherited. The country was disarmed. Taxes were made

ruinously high, and to illustrate this point A Warnyng provided pages of tax rates in Naples and Milan, with their value in English sterling thoughtfully appended.[79]

If this parable were not sufficient warning of Spanish intentions the tract then pointed out that the marriage between Philip and Mary was just a sham. Legally, the marriage was invalid as Philip had already been contracted to a Portugese princess. Moreover Philip cared nothing for his wife and "yf he be once crowned and have his wyll in Englande, he wyll rather dispatche her and take a yonger of whome he maye have children."[80] The tract then repeated the rumour that Philip would not return from Flanders unless he were made King.

To further stir the landed classes into action A Warnyng pointed out the threat to holders of former abbey lands posed by Papal claims. Both the Queen and the English clergy, which had never given up hopes of secular dominion, wished to see the property restored to the Church at the expense of the lay owners.

To assist the machinations of the Spanish and the clergy would be to betray England. Collaborators were warned: "Eyes se well enough thoughe they speak not, so that the quest can lack no information when traytours shalbe examined. Mens eares also wyll this next parliament trye out traytours, by markynge who talketh for his countrey, and who kepeth silence."[81] The day of punishment of traitors was said to be close at hand. Since the destruction of the nation threatened

folk of all estates and religions, resistance was a matter for everyone. It could be avoided only if "all joyne not only in prayer, but also in policie and power together", preventing "by all means possible the perilous dominion of the Spaniards".[82]

This call to resistance is far less articulate or systematic than those found in earlier tracts but it is an advocacy of resistance nonetheless. The tract avoids Scriptural citation or reference to natural, civil, or canon law. It derives its justification and impact from an appeal to xenophobia, self-interest, and self-defence. It might have been just these qualities, rather than Martyr's scholastic distinction, that would have appealed to the patriotic, less-than-religious gentleman, owning former church lands, at which the tract seems aimed.

The Copye of a lettre

Resembling A Warnyng in the vagueness of its call to resistance, its xenophobia, its desire to alert the English nobility, and its lack of overt Protestant content, was a work which was the subject of a letter from the English ambassador in Paris to the Queen in May 1556. Nicholas Wotton told Mary that:

> one Bradford is come here of late, who hath servid a greate lorde of Spaine abowte the King of England ...the sayd Bradford pretendeth to have learnid great secret matters in his service, as well by wordes spoken by him as by his letters and wrytinges which he saith he hath seen. Whereupon he hath made

> a booke, the most sedicious and as lyke to do hurt if it com abrode as eny can be devysid. 83

The tract was The Copye of a letter, sent by John Bradforth to the ...Erles of Arundel, Darbie, Shrewsburye and Pembroke. Its author, who appealed to the English nobility, and those four Earls especially, to prevent the coronation of Philip, based his attack on the Spanish menace on two unique claims. Bradford asserted that he was a loyal Catholic and one with first-hand knowledge of the Spaniards' character and their designs on England. The first claim, that of religious orthodoxy, was designed to ground anti-Spanish sentiment in the minds of those who might resist the argument if it were found to be coming from those Protestant writers who, by 1556, had made the argument their own. Bradford noted that certain heretical tracts had hoped to win converts by attacking the Spaniards[84] but that he himself was content with the state of religion as established by Queen Mary.[85] To bolster his second claim, Bradford openly gave his name and some personal details.[86] A former serving man to "Sir William Skipewiche",[87] Bradford said he had entered the service of a Spanish nobleman and secretly learned the language of his employer. Living with them for several years and reading letters which outlined their plans for England had convinced Bradford that the Spaniards would bring disaster to England if Philip were to be crowned.

What Bradford learned of the Spaniards was that they were lustful, disease-ridden, treacherous,

larcenous, irreligious, greedy, and murderous, in every way worse than Englishmen could imagine. The only two exceptions to the all-pervasiveness of vice amongst the Spanish were said to be the King himself and the Duke of Medinaceli. Just how seriously Bradford meant these exceptions to be taken can be judged by the following passage condemning Spanish sexual mores, written in a rhyming prose which is a feature of the tract.

> Their masking and mumbling in the holi time of lent, maketh many wives brente, the King being present nighte after nighte, as a Prince of moste mighte, which hath power in his hande, that no man dare withstande; yet if that were the greatest evil, we might suffer it wel. For there is no man living but would suffer the King to have wife sister, doughter, maide and all, bothe great and smal, so many as he liste, no man would him resist. [88]

Having maligned the Spanish character, Bradford then accused them of plotting the seizure of England, a task which required the active assistance of Englishmen. The Council was to be used to yield up strongholds and ports that would be manned by Spanish troops. Queen Mary was to impoverish the English nobility and thus render them susceptible to bribery and coercion.[89] Pressure was to be applied to effect Philip's coronation. The sorry result of this would be the destruction of the English nobility, even those who had aided the Spaniards' machinations, the replacement of English law with Spanish law, and the eclipse of Queen Mary's power by a Spanish-appointed viceroy backed by foreign troops.[90] In an appeal to those who looked to

Elizabeth as the nation's heir Bradford claimed to have heard that Philip, once crowned, would ensure that the Princess never inherited. Citing other books on the Spanish menace, such as "the lamentacion of Naples: the mourninge of Millane", Bradford pointed out that the experience of other countries where Spain had dominion was gloomy indeed, with rents raised and taxes wide-spread and exorbitant.[91]

Such were the implications of the threats revealed in the letters Bradford had read and the conversations he had overheard. What he wished from the English nobility was a refusal to cooperate in the Spanish plans, and the prevention of Philip's coronation.[92] Their disobedience of the Queen in this matter was legitimate because she was only to be obeyed in those acts "paste by parliament and confirmed by the whole realm".[93] Mary had no right in law to disinherit the realm of the crown by giving it to her husband as there were heirs living whose deprivation of their rights would constitute a sin.[94] Bradford here equated exercising rule for the benefit of the whole people with seeking to win heaven by following Christ, and ruling by one's own will and pleasure with following the Devil straight to Hell.[95] The coronation of Philip was thus not only unlawful but also an enormous violation in religious terms. Only by the patriotic unity of all classes and religions could such designs be resisted, as treachery or dissension would weaken the country and facilitate the planned

Spanish takeover. As for direct resistance Englishmen were told to "man all your havens strongly", lest the enterprise be launched suddenly, and were urged "when necessite compelleth them, to take all wholly one perfect way, in defending their countrye and withstanding their enemyes."[96]

Bradford's involvement with resistance and pamphleteering did not end with the publication of The Copye in the spring of 1556. Within a year a revised edition of the tract had been written[97] and Bradford had become involved in a scheme to invade England and depose Mary.[98] The plot, to which Bradford attached himself, was that of Thomas Stafford, nephew of Cardinal Pole and grand-son of that Duke of Buckingham executed by Henry VIII. Stafford, whose ancestry led him to present himself as the heir to the English throne, received aid from the French. In April 1557, with a mixed band of patriots and mercenaries which included John Bradford, he descended on Scarborough.[99] Seizing the Castle, Stafford issued a proclamation stating his case and calling on Englishmen to join him.[100] The proclamation, based heavily on Bradford's tract and almost certainly the work of his pen,[101] pronounced Mary a usurper and worthy of deposition as her marriage to Philip had broken for father's will and unspecified English laws. Moreover Mary was also to be resisted because of her tyrannous betrayal of her country to the Spaniards -- "she being naturallye borne haulfe Spanyshe and haulfe Englyshe,

bearythe not herselfe indifferentlye towardes bothe nations...in lovinge Spaniardes, and hating Inglyshemen, inrichinge Spanyardes, and robbinge Englyshemen."[102] Mary was accused of conspiring to yield castles and holds to the Spanish, impoverishing the country and attempting to bring Englishmen under a foreign power. In order to prevent this tyranny and the loss of the crown from its rightful heirs[103] Stafford proposed to remain in Scarborough Castle and gather about him those who wished to join in his resistance. If successful he promised to expel all foreigners, except merchants, and restore the status quo of Henry VIII. Within a few days however, Stafford and his men were the prisoners of Mary's forces and the would-be Duke of Buckingham and other leaders of the enterprise, including Bradford, were on their way to execution in London.[104]

A verye fyne letter

Though neither John Bradford, nor the author of A Warnyng injected into their writings much of a direct appeal to Protestant sentiment, there were other exiles in 1556 who did put their advocacy of resistance in a Protestant framework. One such was the anonymous figure behind A Copye of a verye fyne and wytty letter sent from the ryght Reverende Lewes Lippomanus, a tract which emerged in two different editions dated 1556.[105] It is a work squarely in the mainstream of English exile writing, though its

central figure is an Italian bishop in a Polish setting, and contains the familiar theme of a warning to the nobility of clerical designs on their property, power, and life.

The pamphlet is divided into three parts. The main body of the text is comprised of what purports to be an English translation of a letter from the papal nuncio in Poland, Luigi Lippomanno, to "Peter Conterini, gentylman of Venice, at Rome".[106] There are also two prefaces, one seemingly from Michael Throckmorton,[107] the translator, to Cardinal Pole, and the other from the tract's Protestant editor to the reader. The Lippomanno text, which may be based on a European Protestant original,[108] and the Throckmorton preface are fabrications, designed to discredit the Catholic clergy.

Lippomanno's letter presents the bishop in an unflattering light. His harsh attitudes in dealing with Protestants, he is made to say, have won him only enemies and he fears that his continued presence would only harm the Catholic cause. He also fears that his policy of advising the execution of Protestant leaders in Germany and in Poland might be disclosed and the pope associated with counselling the "choppynge of heades, and other such like violences: Yea I understand they speake it all redy".[109] He begs Contarini to secure his recall to Rome.

"Throckmorton's" preface seeks to link Cardinal Pole and the English bishops with Lippomanno's policy

of eliminating the enemies of the Catholic clergy. He tells Pole that he is sure that the "popish prelacy" is maintained in England by similar means. Nobles are bribed or, failing this, executed in order that, with the English lay leadership weakened, the clerics may oppress the people and rule as they will.[110] Thanks to Pole the country has been brought into "hunger, misery and dissencion" but such tactics had best be kept secret lest Lippomanno's fate be duplicated in England.

The editor's preface to the reader draws attention to these dangerous designs of the clergy and in a justification of resistance, noteworthy for its casual presentation, calls for action. The basis of this call is the appeal to the natural law which permits self-defence. Both the nobility and the people were urged to "put their handes and wyttes to pul their neckes from under the tyrannye of the Bishop of Rome (God and mans enemye) and suche wicked practicers and not willingly put their owne neckes in to halters: but rather defende them selves, according to Goddes lawe and the lawe of nature, than to sufre them selves to be wilfully murthered." So long as they had God's glory in mind, He would prosper whatever enterprise the nobility and people undertook.[111]

By mid-1556 the policy of "chopping of heads", of which A verye vyne letter had spoken, was much in evidence in England. The leaders of the Edwardian Protestant church who had decided to remain in the

country had been exterminated[112] and the conspirators in the most dangerous enterprise against the Marian regime since Wyatt were undergoing trial and execution.[113] Two of the leading laymen among the exiles also fell victim to the Marian authorities. Sir Peter Carew, a veteran of Wyatt's rebellion and privy to conspiracies among exiles in France, and Sir John Cheke, a supporter of Jane Grey and a sojourner in Strasbourg, were kidnapped in the Low Countries and returned to England to stand trial.[114] To the exiles in Germany and Switzerland the situation must have appeared grim and the chance of a successful rising, or other eventuality permitting an early return to England, remote.[115]

A Shorte Treatise

In this dark hour there issued from Strasbourg the most articulate and sophisticated of the Marian resistance tracts, A Shorte Treatise of politicke power, and of the true Obedience which Subjectes owe to Kynges and other civile Governours, with an Exhortacion to all true naturall Englishe men[116] by John Ponet.[117] As the title indicates it is a book in two parts. The first, in the form of a (relatively) dispassionate work on political theory, is an attack on the claims of royal absolutism, in which Ponet is led to defend the deposition and assassination of evil rulers. In the second part Ponet sets aside the aspect of a philosopher, a role which he found increasingly

hard to maintain as the book progressed, and takes on that of a prophet. Cursing, prophesying, and interpreting marvels and wonders, Ponet, in his "Exhortacion", calls for a spiritual renewal in his country. Both parts, however dissimilar in form, share one end, the destruction of the obedience Englishmen rendered their Queen.

Ponet starts his treatise by clearing the ground of arguments in favour of absolutism and unqualified obedience. This is accomplished by an exposition on the origins and purpose of political power in which Ponet states that civil government originated not in man's reason but in God who laid its foundations in natural law.[118] This natural law, perceptible to every man, is also set forth in the Decalogue, in the New Testament commandment to love God above all and thy neighbour as thyself, and in the Golden Rule, to do as you would be done by. These natural laws were to be the mark against which all men's acts were to be measured, "the touchestone to trye every mannes doings (be he King or beggar) whether they be good or evil. Bi this all mennes lawes be discerned, whether they be just or unjuste, godly or wicked."[119] Offenders against the law had not been punished until after the Great Flood, when God, seeing that his policy of leniency had not served to restrain wicked men, instituted government. The form that civil government took was, in every place, "lefte to the discrecion of

the people" and the authority to make and execute laws could rest in a variety of institutions.[120] But whatever shape the constitution took, government existed for one purpose "that is, to the mayntenance of justice, to the wealthe and benefite of the hole multitude, and not of the superiour and governours along."[121] Ponet then noted that where rulers had abused their positions the people had changed the state, deposing tyrants and altering constitutions.

This view of civil government, limited in power with sovereignty resident in the whole people, was not one that Ponet saw shared by contemporary rulers. Their view seemed to be that they were vested with an absolute power to break any law: natural, divine, positive or customary, and to treat their subjects as their bondslaves. These claims by rulers were examined and dismissed by Ponet. Princes might break neither divine nor natural laws as they were ordained by God and rulers caould not pretend they were wiser or more just than God, or that they had any authority to alter laws that they had no hand in making.[122] As to positive laws, princes were no more absolute. To demonstrate this, Ponet made a distinction between two types of rulers: those to whom the people have given the authority to make positive law by themselves, and those to whom the people have not given such authority and who rule in a mixed state. The first sort of ruler, who may properly be termed a tyrant, may make or break any laws "in maters indifferent", that is in

things which have no sort of consequence to the commonwealth. However, in respect of those laws "godly and profitably ordayned for the common wealthe" princes have no power to break them, as this would be to contravene the purpose for which rulers were instituted -- "to doo good, not to doo evil: to take awaie evil, not to increase it: to give example of well doing, not to be procurers of evil: to procure the wealthe and benefite of their subjectes, and not to worke their hurt or undoing."[123] Ponet concludes that if tyrants are thus circumscribed, rulers in mixed states can be no freer to break the law. Clever use is then made of a scriptural passage, usually adduced by proponents of the case for obedience, to argue that all rulers should regard themselves as bound by positive law. The passage is the Pauline injunction from Romans 13: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God." Dissecting the phrase Ponet noted that by the word "soul" "is comprehended, every persone, and none excepted" and that by the word "power" is meant, not the rulers, but "the ministerie and autoritie, that all officers of justice doo execute".[124] Princes therefore are subject to their own positive laws. To claim otherwise would make God, who had ordained government, the author of tyranny, a thought which Ponet termed "a great blasphemie". Ponet's contentions on the nature of political power are buttressed by

arguments drawn from antiquity, scripture, civil law, canon law, and the conciliarists.

Having shown that princes are limited in their power, Ponet turned to consider the responsibility of subjects in their obedience. He accused Anabaptists of being too lax on this point, just as English Catholics were too strict. The latter, he said, wanted the civil power obeyed in all things and used scriptural arguments for obedience to place Englishmen in the category of bondslaves. In fact, the civil power had limits and was not to be obeyed if it contradicted God's laws, as God was the ultimate source of authority. Not only were ungodly laws to be disobeyed, so too were those commands which violated civil justice or which tended to the hurt of the commonwealth.[125] Subjects, when faced with such evil commands, had no obligation, by the natural law of self-defense, to consent, by obedience, to their own self-destruction. Their obligations ought to be first toward their country and not to the prince, who was, after all, only one part of the whole and not even an essential part. The natural conclusion to such arguments was that "common wealthes mai stande well ynough and florishe, albeit ther be no kinges, but contrary wise without a common wealthe ther can be no king. Common wealthes and realmes may live, whan the head is cut of, and may put on a newe head, that is, make them a newe governour, when they see their olde heade seke to

muche his owne will and not the wealthe of the hole body, for the which he was only ordained."[126]

In considering the legality of the deposition or murder of a tyrant, Ponet noted that though there was no positive law, in Christian realms at any rate, which seemed to sanction this, he could offer a host of examples to prove its legitimacy. The long continuance of deposition and tyrannicide throughout history was adduced to show that such practice was consonant with God's judgement. The Old Testament was replete with such examples. English history too could offer the fates of Edward II and Richard II;[127] while European history had the recent example of King Christian of Denmark. Moreover the Catholics themselves had long held that deposition of an evil or an unfit ruler was acceptable practice. Popes had deposed princes in France, Hungary and Portugal, and conciliarists, grounding themselves on natural law, had held that even Popes themselves could be deposed by the body of the Church.[128] The power to remove evil heads, of church or state, rested with the whole body for it was they who had given their rulers the authority to govern, "as all lawes, usages and policies doo declare and testifie". This authority might be taken back, if abused, as men revoked proxies and powers of attorney.[129]

The agents of the correction to be visited on tyrants were, in the first instance, to be those in the state entrusted with this responsibility. Ponet

spoke of "those which have the autoritie to refourme" and "those that have the just autoritie to punish evil princes."[130] In England this power seemed to lie in several institutions. The power that classical ephors and tribunes had once wielded was now, in England and France, vested in Parliaments "wherin ther mette and assembled of all sortes of people, and nothing could be done without the knowlage and consent of all."[131] Though the English Parliament was still in operation, Ponet also pointed to another institution, now suppressed, which had once served to correct tyrants on behalf of "the hole congregacion or common wealthe." This was the office of the High Constable "unto whose autoritie it pertained, not only to summone the King personally before the parliament or other courtes of judgement (to answer and receive according to justice) but also upon juste occasion to committe him unto warde."[132] Of this position, suppressed by the Tudor kings, only memories remained, but Ponet saw others in a position to act. Judges were expected to proceed against princes who violated positive law just as if they were private citizens acting criminally. "If a prince robbe and spoile his subjects, it is thefte, and as a thefe ought to be punished. If he kill and murther them contrary or without the lawes of his countreye, it is murther, and as a murtherer he ought to be punished...And those that be judges in common wealthes, ought (upon complaynt) to summone and cite

them to answer to their crymes."[133] The other body to whom Ponet thought the nation might also look in seeking defence against tyranny was the nobility. Indeed Ponet saw the origins of nobility in those men "who revenged and delivered the oppressed people out of the handes of their governours, who abused their autoritie, and wickedly, cruelly and tirannously ruled over them: the people of a grate and thankfull minde, gave them that estimacion and honour."[134]

Ponet, however, like most other of his fellow exiles, knew that there was scant hope of help from Parliament, magistrates, or the nobility in the England of Mary Tudor. He knew how Parliaments, rather than being the defenders of the people against despotism, could be tools in the hands of a tyrant, for Mary's Parliaments had restored idolatry and allowed the murder of innocents. . Contemporary nobility was noteworthy more for its greed and idle living than for its service to the state. Indeed so evident was the failure of the English nobility to fulfill its proper functions that Ponet dedicated an entire chapter to the proposition that no trust was to be given to princes and potentates. Echoing the tone of Certayne Questions and Bradford's Copye of a lettre,[135] Ponet castigated the lust for power, the treachery, and the greed that marked the ruling classes in general and the magnates in Edwardian and Marian England in particular.[136] He asked how nobles came to be distinguished in the first instance,

> seing all men came of one man and one woman? for their nimble diceing and conning carding? for their fine singing and daunceing? for their open bragging and swearing? for their false flering and flattering? for their subtil piking and stealing? for their cruel polling and pilling? for their merciles man murthering? for their unnatural destroieng of their natural countrey men, and traiterous betraieng of their country? 137

A particular member of the Tudor nobility was said to have become noble by his "bribery, extorcion, dissimulacion, ambicion, robbing of the King and such like vertues."[138]

However if these constitutional remedies were seen to fail, the people were not without chance of redress. Ponet, alone among the exiles, believed that any clergyman might excommunicate a tyrant and that such an action would be binding in heaven as well as on earth.[139] But if the church neglected its duty and the people and nobility were fearful or otherwise unwilling to act, there was yet another remedy -- the individual tyrannicide. Such a remedy had been used by pre-Christian man who could see, by the light of natural law, that it was proper to cut off a diseased limb that threatened the whole body. This principle had been endorsed by Christ who called for the destruction of unprofitable trees and also demonstrated in the Old Testament and secular histories. In some Christian lands, said Ponet, this natural-law principle had found expression in positive laws which permitted private citizens to legitimately kill even a magistrate should he be found in bed with a man's wife or daughter, or suddenly seek to kill someone,

or intend to betray his country to foreigners.[140] Ponet, pleading the need for decency, order and charity, then set out his own view:

> I thinke it can not be maintained by Goddes worde, that any private man maie kill, except (when execucion of juste punishment upon tirannes, idolaters, and traiterous governours is either by the hole state utterly neglected, or the prince with the nobilitie and counsail conspire the subversion or alteracion of their countrey and people) any private man have som special commandement or surely proved mocion of God: As Moses had to kill the Egipcian, Phinees the Lecherours, and Ahud King Eglon, with suche like: or be otherwise commaunded or permitted by common autoritie upon juste occasion and common necessitie to kill. [141]

Though it may seem that Ponet has arrived at this sanction of tyrannicide reluctantly or that he has circumscribed it to a great extent, there is much in Shorte Treatise to show Ponet's belief in the legitimacy and need of such a step. He termed assassination a "laufull shifte" and applauded the murders of Old Testament tyrants Athaliah, Jezabel,[142] Jehoram, Eglon and Sisera, whose deaths he claimed were approved by the Holy Ghost. Moreover it is crucial to an understanding of Ponet's view of murder by private men to note that his sanction of it had precisely described a situation which he believed existed at that moment in England, where tyrants and idolators ruled and where princes conspired to deliver the country into the control of foreigners. In commending the murders committed by Mattathias Maccabee he equated the situation in Israel, where a foreign government and its native

collaborators sought to enforce idolatry, with that in Marian England.[143] Ponet was also at pains to explain why the method of an assassin acting alone might be a preferable course of action, when he defended the deeds of the Biblical tyrannicide Ehud. He asked his readers to note that "the texte saieth not, that Ehud was sent of the people to kill the king, nor that he tolde them what he intended: for by that meane, one Judas or other wolde have betraied him, and so should he have ben drawn, hanged and quartered for his enterprise, and all his conspiratours have lost bothe life, landes and goods for their conspiracie."[144]

Should all these means of resisting tyrants by force prove unsuccessful, there was yet remaining to the people the remedy of penance and prayer. Here, despite his earlier avowals that God could not be considered the author of tyranny, Ponet shows himself, for a moment, heir to that tradition of thought which saw oppression as a plague from God. Should the people repent their sins which had caused God to show his anger and pray that he would withdraw his wrath, divine mercy would be shown and peace and plenty returned.[145] Should England not repent, in spite of warnings from the Edwardian clergy, present miseries, and divinely-sent marvels including comets and monstrous births, the situation would only grow worse until Spanish tyranny and foreign wars utterly destroyed the nation.[146]

It is worth considering Ponet's view of tyranny and examining what acts he deemed serious enough offences to prompt resistance. In doing this, one is first struck by the secular tone of many of the instances of tyranny cited. In his first mention of the power of the people to change rulers and constitutions Ponet listed princes' oppression, abuse of authority, and lewdness as causes of popular resistance.[147] In one place it was theft of subjects' goods, waste of the national treasure, disarming of the populace, paranoid persecution of supposed enemies, and oath-breaking that marked a tyrant, and in another it was over-taxation, destruction of the nobility, murder, and the introduction of foreign laws.[148] The most notable overthrow of an English tyrant was said to have been undertaken because Edward II had unlawfully "killed his subjectes, spoiled them of their goodes and wasted the treasure of the Realme."[149] The introduction of foreign rule was also condemned in numerous cases, ranging from Old Testament invasions to Spanish actions in America.[150] It is also interesting to note that when he approvingly cited the murders of tyrants who sought to enforce idolatry (and to whom Queen Mary and her government were suggestively likened), Ponet, more often than not, took pains to list the secular as well as religious crimes of the deposed rulers. Queen Athaliah was said to have murdered the rightful heirs and attempted "to transpose the right of the crowne to strangers".

Jezebel's part in the theft of Naboth's vineyard was outlined. King Jehoram was cited for both his "idolatrous tyrannie and evil government" and Eglon was accused of bringing in foreigners, overtaxation, murder and rape.[151] To Ponet it was clear that just as disobedience and resistance was to be the response to rulers acting against the laws of God, so too was it to be the proper reaction of the whole people, its institutions, or individuals when civil justice or the commonwealth was threatened.[152]

It is not to detract from the importance of the part occupied by the notion of religious oppression in the Shorte Treatise that the secular content of Ponet's resistance theory has been underlined here, but rather to counter-balance the views of two recent historians who have sought to place Ponet in the same camp as those two writers later in the exile, Christopher Goodman and John Knox. When, to accomplish this, Paul Little claims that Ponet had "stated his protest fundamentally in terms of Mary's radical violation of the revealed law of Scripture",[153] he ignores Ponet's grounding of his resistance theory in natural law and the overwhelming citation of secular justification for resistance.

Quentin Skinner makes a similar error. He states that "the position of the English Calvinists was even stronger than the Scottish or European Calvinist churches despite the accession of Mary in 1553 and the resulting persecutions. The previous reign had

witnessed an official reception of the Calvinist faith, the memory of which served to encourage the radical Calvinists under the Marian reaction to make their revolutionary appeal directly to the largely sympathetic body of the people."[154] It is, however, impossible to find any historian of the Marian period prepared to state that the English people were "largely sympathetic" to Calvinist doctrines. In fact the perception of the situation by the exiles themselves was that the Edwardian reception of the faith had been "official" only, a matter of lip-gospelling and hypocrisy in high places, and of ignorance and misunderstanding among the people. The memory of this, far from serving to encourage any of the exiles, was cause for reproach and exhoration to repentance, as demonstrated in virtually every one of their tracts.[155] Ponet's "Exhortacion" at the end of the Shorte Treatise is an excellent example of the despair felt by the exile clergy at the type of reception given their faith by the populace. Here is Ponet on the reaction of the English people to the preaching of God's word:

> But ye passed nothing on it, but as the Jewes being downed sic in sinne, mocked, scorned and murthered the prophetes of God which long before prophecied unto them their captivities and utter destruction: so ye laughed and jested at your preachers wordes, nothing regarding the threattes of God, but contemnying them, you increaceing in your wickedness, and now at leynght sic murthering most cruelly the ministers of God.[156]

If the estimation of Protestant strength among the people was such a low one, we must seek elsewhere for an explanation of why Ponet, as Skinner points out,

went beyond that appeal of Continental Protestants to the inferior magistracy. Firstly, it must be stated that, despite Skinner,[157] Ponet did not consider that his call to resistance was made principally to "the whole body of the godly people,"(emphasis mine) that they should "rise up against the Congregation of Satan in order that they should establish the congregation of Christ." Ponet was interested in establishing a right to resistance which any Englishman could use to justify his opposition to the Marian regime. Knowing he could not rely on a fickle and often ungodly populace to rise in defence of his type of Protestantism, Ponet made his appeal as broadly-based as possible. Certainly part of his call was concerned with religion and especially Protestantism, but Ponet wished his emphasis on secular tyranny -- over-taxation, destruction of the nobility, involvement in foreign wars, sexual abuse of English women, transportation to foreign lands, and on xenophobia -- to weld Englishmen into a patriotic unity against the Marian regime that would transcend class and private interest. He decried the divisiveness that made England a prey to foreign invasion "and all because the gentilmen and commones agred not among themselves...Who is a natural Englishe man, that will not in tyme forsee and considre the miserie towards his countrye and himselfe, and by all meanes seke to little it?"[158] There is then in Ponet a call to the citizen as well as to the godly. Secondly, Ponet's appeal beyond that to the inferior

magistracy reflected that distrust of the English nobility we have noted before. By allowing the whole people, or parts of it as small as a single man, to resist, Ponet avoided having to rely on a Parliament and a nobility that had proved itself unwilling to act. This explains Ponet's defence of tyrannicide and his praise of exile conspiracy.[159]

The Lamentacion of England

A tract which echoed Ponet's concern with both secular and religious tyranny but which lacked the boldness and clarity of the bishop's conclusions appeared in 1557. Entitled The Lamentacion of England[160] it placed itself, along with other exile protest, in a long line of books warning the English nation of social ills and the threat of clerical domination. Just as the Supplication of Beggars and Complaint to the Parliament House had addressed the problems of Henrician England, the Supplicacyon to the Quenes Majestie and A Warnyng to England had spoken out against Marian excesses. Now, seeing that that decay and final destruction of the nation was at hand, The Lamentacion would speak out, to induce action, prayer, and repentance. Recalling that the martyred Latimer in 1549 had warned King Edward and the court of the perils of allowing Mary or Elizabeth to marry a foreigner;[161] the author of The Lamentacion noted how real those warnings had become and described the sort of tyranny from which England was now suffering.

Much of the tract's venom is xenophobic, seeking to induce resistance to Mary by associating the Queen with the threat of subjugation by foreigners. Of Mary it was said that she "toke the most part off her blude and stomake off her spanish mother" and sought to enrich her Spanish connections at the expense of her native subjects. Her economic policies had doubled prices, impoverished the country and put Englishmen out of work.[162] The better to secure the coronation of Philip and the dominion of the Spanish, nobles were bribed and, failing that, persecuted unjustly as the cases of John and Nicholas Throgmorton, Peter Carew and John Cheke[163] and the Earl of Devon[164] demonstrated. To further weaken the country, those seeking to aid Philip tried to provoke war with France, a war that the near-bankrupt country could not afford. Since these fetches and their manipulation of Parliament had failed to achieve the coronation of the Spaniard it was stated that the obvious next step was an invasion that would result in the disinheriting of the native ruling class and their replacement by foreigners. The Queen's vow to maintain the country's ancient privileges and customs was clearly not being upheld.[165]

Religious tyranny was also castigated by the tract. The persecution of the Protestant Church and the martyrdom of its members was noted with the Queen likened to Jezebel who had murdered God's prophets. The presence of idolatry in England was said to be the cause of the divine anger threatening the country.[166]

The remedies for this tyranny consisted of both prayer and action. The stated intent of The Lamentacion was to induce the populace to pray for God's deliverance of England. Said the tract, "We have now non other wais nor meanes then only to submitt our selves under the mighty hand off God." The deliverance that was craved was a violent one, with tyrant-killers such as Ehud, Gideon, Sampson, Jehu, and the Maccabees as the model. This call for a divinely-sanctioned tyrannicide was bolstered by another call with the emphasis on patriotism, when The Lamentacion declared that "it be the dewty of every Christian and trewe-harted english man, and that man that perceiveth that his native contre like to come in to ruyn and destruction and doth not indevore hym selff by all the meanes he can devise, for the deliveraunce thereof, the same is not worthy to be counted a true hartid englishman but a traitoure to his contre."[167]

This appeal became even more urgent by the time of the two 1558 editions of The Lamentacion. The tract's Addicyon claimed that the European war into which the Queen had forced her country for the sake of her husband had profited Spain but had brought only disaster to England. The loss of Calais and the other forts in France was part of Mary's deliberate strategy to weaken the country. Contrary to the duties of a ruler she had let fortifications and the navy decay in order to more easily bring England under

the rule of Spain.[168] In this misrule she had been abetted by a weak and malleable Council -- a contravention, it was said, of the conditions on which she had been given the throne by her father.[169]

The remedies prescribed by the author were again a mixture of prayer and human actions against a Queen who sought to betray her own realm. Englishmen were advised: "Oh pray pray pray pray. That God wull take our wycked rulers away." In the meanwhile independent steps were to be taken to defend the country. English fortresses were to be taken by English nobles and commons, garrisoned and built up. Armor, ordinance, and treasure were to be prevented from leaving the country and kept to prevent the plans that would bring England under a foreign prince.[170]

An Admonition to Callays

Though, unlike some earlier Marian tracts, The Lamentacion lacked bold, specific proposals for expression of the resistance that it sought to prompt, it did resemble most of its predecessors in seeing tyranny in both secular and religious oppression. In another work of 1557 we can see the religious element begin to predominate. The tract was entitled An Admonition to the Towne of Callays[171] by "R.P.", almost certainly Robert Pownoll, a minister of the Wesel/Aarau congregation.[172] Calais' safety and its continued possession by England had been a concern to exiles before,[173] but now Pownoll was to deal with the

topic in a comprehensive way.

It was Pownoll's belief that Calais, like England, had been preached the true gospel under Edward VI and, like England, had reacted hypocritically. In punishment, a tyrant was visited upon the realm in the form of "a moste wicked and idolatrous Queene. A very Jezebel, that is, a frinde to Baal and his priests and an utter enemie to God and his people. Yea another Athalia..."[174] Pownoll went further in his use of Old Testament simile and likened England to Israel under its tyrant Queens. Both realms had seen idolatry flourish, true prophets slain, and innocent men spoiled of their lands, imprisoned, or forced to flee. Calais could not hope to escape the punishment that was sure to follow. In fact, the city might well be the first to suffer the likely invasion and other plagues, as the French had long hoped to recover it for themselves.

The only guarantee of successful resistance to these interlopers was repentance and a willingness to boldly assert the Protestantism that had once been a boast of Calais; a city whose "gospelick profession" had been universally known. Though there were in England a few nobles who would one day rise to drive out the idolatrous tyrant and her priests,[175] Calais could expect no help from her inferior magistracy, nor from her soldiers and merchants, a cowardly lot who had abjured the true religion.[176] Only repentance by the

people would ensure the divine help necessary for the struggle, which was a legitimate resistance in self-defence, "lawful to God, the laws of the land and instincts of nature." Neither oaths of obedience nor loyalty to the Queen could stand in the way of resistance. "For thow art not so farre sworne to obaie, as by obedience to show theyself a Trayteresse to thyne owne country: Neyther art thow so subject to this Quene, as for hir sake, to with drawe for ever thy subjection from the crowne of England, and the ryghtful inheritour of the same."[177]

Admonition to Callays is a tract markedly more religious in tone than many of its predecessors which had advocated resistance. The language is violent and intense, much more in the idiom of the "erneste gospellers". The Catholic authorities become "sweinishe papistical pigges...with the stinkinge dounge of dissaivable doctrine". Protestant renegades who engage in idolatry and the "registringe of names in the booke of the Beaste" are seen to "with the sowe, wallowe themselfes in the stinkinge puddell of papistrie againe".[178] The marks of tyranny are less secular. The worst of the abuses committed in Marian England was said to be "the universal sheddinge of the innocent bloud of the constant witnesses of Jesus Christ now flowinge throughout every Shire, Cyty and Towne cryinge for spedy vengeance."[179] Calais was chastised for bewailing its "temporal palaces" more than the loss of true preaching. Finally it is

interesting to note how closely bound are repentance and resistance. Unlike some of the exile tracts extolling the virtues of passivity, Admonition to Callays does not see repentance as an alternative to resistance but rather as a necessary precondition to it.

A Warning to England to Repent

Pownell's advice to Calais went unheeded and the city fell to the French early in 1558. Its fate became the subject of several tracts warning England of like dangers. One such tract was by a writer in the small Aarau colony, Bartholomew Traheron, and was entitled A Warning to England to Repent, and to Turne to God from Idolatrie and poperie by the terrible example of Calice given the 7 of March, Anno D. 1558.[180] Traheron felt that as England's sins and commitment to idolatry were so much greater than those of its former stronghold in France, that disaster could not be far away. Like the author of The Lamentacion, Traheron perceived a conspiracy which sought to weaken England -- the deliberate neglect of Calais and the entry into a European war which destroyed the realm's best officers and soldiers were token of this.[181] Those who might prevent this disaster, it was said, were either too weak or uninterested. Traheron told England that, "in the ordre of thy nobilitie al the godlie maie be graven in one ringe...Thy noble men ar

ether starcke cowardes, or starcke fooles for the most parte, and more mete for their effeminateness to handle a spindle, than to beare a speare." The common folk, though they possessed more godly men than the nobility, were so enfeebled by poverty and misery that they were in no better position to resist.[182]

The figure behind this betrayal was the Queen, who was castigated in this tract more comprehensively than in any other work. Traheron claimed: "Thy ruler hath bathed her selfe, and swimmeth in the holie blood of most innocent, vertuous, and excellent personages... She is despiteful, cruel, bloodie, wilful, furious, gileful, stuffed with painted processes, with simulation and dissimulation, voide of honestie, void of upright dealinge, voide of all semelie virtues." He also added idolatrous, ambitious, and vice-ridden to Mary's list of attributes.[183]

Though for now Traheron was urging only repentance on the Queen and the nation, he showed, in his discussion of the Wyatt rebellion, that he could support resistance. Wyatt was termed "noble", while Suffolk and Grey were referred to as "the good duke" and "that worthie man". Their actions were not classified as rebellious but were a rising which Mary herself had provoked. The killing of these patriots meant that the Queen had "stained her selfe with blood".[184]

Superior Powers

In 1558 members of the Genevan exile colony

entered the debate over obedience. The first to publish a work advocating resistance was one of the settlement's leaders, Christopher Goodman, the Edwardian Lady Margaret Professor in divinity at Oxford.[185] Goodman's exile had begun at Strasbourg where he re-established the close contact he had had at Oxford with Peter Martyr.[186] In 1555 he moved with others of the Strasbourg congregation to Frankfurt where he soon became a convert to the cause of further reform in church ceremonial, siding with John Knox against his erstwhile colleagues. After Knox's expulsion from Frankfort and the decision by the hotter sort of gospellers to withdraw from the colony, Goodman moved, later in 1555, with others such as Whittingham and Gilby, to Geneva.[187] There Knox and Goodman were elected ministers, a position they both held until the end of the exile.

The hall-mark of the English congregation at Geneva was a drive for purity and uncompromising reformation. Their literary efforts in 1556 and 1557 had aimed at creating new foundations for the Protestant Church in England. A new liturgy had been formulated, and new translations of Scripture begun with the emphasis placed on the primacy of the Word and unflinching obedience to its demands. It is not surprising then that when it became necessary for Geneva to speak out on the question of obedience it was to the dictates of the Bible, "to wit what God him self requireth", that Goodman drew attention.

Goodman's work was entitled How Superior Powers Oght to be Obeyd of Their Subjects: and wherin they may lawfully by Gods Worde by disobeyed and resisted - wherein also is declared the cause of all this present miserie in England, and the onely way to remedy the same.[188] The Introduction, by William Whittingham, stated that congregational leaders had approached Goodman after a sermon of his on obedience, drawn from the Book of Acts, and asked him to expand on his ideas in printed form.[189] After "conferringe his articles and chief propositions with the best learned in these partes (who approved them)",[190] Goodman agreed to publication, thinking even that the work might be translated for European readers.

It was Goodman's belief that the time was ripe for a new concept of true obedience. Man's own reason was an insufficient guide in this area and had led only to confusion and wrong thinking. Even godly and learned men had taught "that it was not lawful in anie case to resist and disobeye the superior powers: but rather to laye downe their heades, and submitte them selves to all kindes of punishmentes and tyrannye."[191] It was time to base one's judgement entirely on Scripture, a source of political guidance as trustworthy as if God himself were speaking aloud out of the heavens.[192] It was not for Goodman to rely on secular history, the writers of antiquity, the Church Fathers, or the conciliarists.[193] The touch-stone

for all action was to be the Word of God, with no new revelation required.[194]

The key Scriptural command on obedience Goodman found in the Book of Acts where two Apostles, Peter and John, were commanded by the lawful authorities to cease preaching their gospel. Their reply was that it was better to obey God than man. This precept, which ought always to guide Christians everywhere, had been ignored in England with disastrous results.

There were two principal ways in which Englishmen had erred by preferring obedience to men to that owed to God. The first was in the matter of Mary's succession to the crown. It was Goodman's contention that Scriptural precepts ought to have been followed here rather than national custom or law. A Christian nation ought always to refer to those rules on kingship that God had given in the Bible and not, as pagans or heathens would, to the law of the realm.[195] These Scriptural dictates prescribed who might succeed to the governance of a people professing God and how such a ruler must behave. Failure to follow these specifications deprived the monarch of any claim to legitimacy. Goodman stated that should a ruler not measure up to the Biblical demands then "it is manifeste that he is not chosen of God...and ought not to be anonynted or elected as their king and governour, what title or right so ever he seeme to have therunto by civile policie".[196] The Deuteronomic code of kingship decreed that rulers should be

chosen from among the "brethren", a command which Goodman saw set forth not only to avoid the rule of foreigners but chiefly to prevent "that monster in nature, and disordre amongst men, which is the Empire and government of a woman".[197] Though not the first of the exiles to decry women's rule,[198] Goodman became the boldest to date in setting out his objections on these grounds to Mary's accession. He bolstered the argument from Deuteronomy with the Pauline injunctions that women should keep silent in the congregation and be subject to their husbands. Interestingly, Goodman sought extra-scriptural support for his claims and pointed out that as women in England were barred from being inferior officers such as peers, councillors, or sheriffs, it was hardly fit that they should bear supreme power. He also added that, if God's word were insufficient proof of his point, nature itself would demonstrate the absurdity of woman's rule. Freely admitting that English law permitted daughters to succeed, Goodman reiterated that God's law should have been obeyed upon Edward's death and that the choice of a fit man would have spared the country such misery.[199]

Goodman also alleged that Scripture barred Mary from the throne in yet another way, her bastardy. The illegitimacy of her birth had been agreed upon by her late Chancellor and leading Catholic churchmen (yet another exile reference to Gardiner's <u>De Vera Obedentia</u>) and by all the universities in England,

France and Italy.[200] The Scriptural judgement on bastards, according to Goodman, was that they were to be "deprived of all honor", thus rendering Mary ineligible to be Queen. Again Goodman was prepared to adduce non-scriptural evidence to support his argument, and claimed that English law preferred the rights of the lawfully begotten to those of the illegitimate offspring.[201]

Clearly Mary, according to the Scriptural precepts on kingship presented by Goodman, was a usurper whose sex and birth should have disqualified her from bearing rule in a Christian realm. There were, however, more, and more serious, objections to her reign, also based on Scripture. The Queen was an idolater -- not a secret infidel but one who, through oppression, enforced her blasphemy and idolatry. She had suppressed the true religion and demanded obedience to her compelling of the people to such abominations as auricular confession, pilgrimages and the mass. She had arrested, tortured and murdered those who clung to the true belief.[202] In all of this she had proved herself an oath-breaker, having deceived those who helped her to the throne believing she would permit them the practice of their religion.[203] She was also a traitor who sought to deliver her country into the hands of her adulterous Spanish husband. To accomplish this treachery Mary involved England in foreign wars in the hope that the country would be weakened and made vulnerable "to be wasted, spoyled, oppressed,

possessed, and replenished with ungodly Spanyardes."[204]

England had procured itself (and maintained) an idolatrous, murderous, and treacherous Queen because of its willingness to obey men's laws before those of God, but obedience to divine precept could provide a remedy. Goodman had established that, as the Apostles had done, one must refuse to obey an ungodly command. So much had always been standard Protestant doctrine; Goodman went further and claimed that it was an insufficient discharge of Christian duty to stop at mere refusal of such orders -- one must act affirmatively and do the contrary. Daniel, when ordered by a pagan king to pray to none but him, might have continued to pray to God in secret but chose to publicly flout this ungodly command by worshipping in plain view.[205]

This principle was to be followed even if it should lead to violence, as the example of the Maccabees showed. When ordered to serve foreign gods Mattathias refused, murdered an official and a Jewish collaborator, and went into open revolt. This Goodman deemed to be "manifeste resisting of the superior power, being but man, to the intent he might shewe true obedience to his Lorde and God, in defending and maynteyning his Lawes (which he calleth the covenant of their fathers) yea and with the temporal sworde to the uttermost of his power."[206]

Goodman's concept of what constituted an ungodly order shows the predominance of religious oppression

in his view of tyranny. If ordered to "trot on pilgrimage" to acknowledge papal authority, to commit idolatry by attending the mass, or to persecute Protestants, one must resist, despite loyalty to the crown, or threat of physical danger.[207] Secular motivations for resistance were to be avoided, and Englishmen were warned not to seek "private gaynes or promotion" under a cloak of religious zeal.[208] Goodman's perception of the Marian tyranny omitted any consideration of economic or judicial concerns that marked the works of many of his predecessors.

The question of who was to resist ungodly commands is an important element in Superior Powers. Goodman noted that when men consider the dangers and discomforts involved "then is there great curtesie made who first shall take the enterprise in hand."[209] Taking his cue from the Continental Protestant tradition of resistance theory, especially befitting in a man who had lived in the house of Peter Martyr, Goodman believed that the primary responsibility for casting out idolaters belonged to the inferior magistracy. Goodman's view of this body of men differed, however, from both Martyr and Calvin. As expressed in The Cohabitacyon, Martyr's view of the inferior magistracy, in terms of who might resist tyranny, was restricted to those powers within a realm deriving their authority from the supreme authority. Those who ranked highly only because of wealth or ancient lineage were counted as private citizens with no

special obligation to defend the true religion.[210] Calvin's Institutes saw the inferior magistracy as an ephoral institution. In each realm a certain body, such as Parliament in England, the Estates in many European countries, and the ephors and tribunes of classical times, acted as guardian of the people against the tyranny of its rulers.[211] Goodman's definition was broader than either of these and seems to contain not only every conceivable office holder but all those with social eminence. He listed officials such as councillors, justices, mayors, sheriffs, constables, and even jailers and bailiffs in his compendium of "inferiour officers". Goodman also included among those with special responsibility, men without an official position such as nobles, knights, and landlords.[212] All these men had been placed by God in positions of rank or responsibility to defend the people from tyranny and destroy idolatry.[213]

Like his exile predecessors who had written on this question, Goodman was not optimistic about the chances of the inferior magistracy responding to a call for resistance against the Queen and her regime. From the beginning officials in England had obeyed Mary and had carried out her persecution of the faithful. The European war in which England had become embroiled had succeeded in causing opponents of Mary to place patriotism above all else and to enlist under her banner. In such a situation it is not surprising to see Goodman, as exile writers before him had done,

turn to the people:

> And thoghe it appeare at the firste sight a great disordre, that the people shulde take unto them the punishment of transgression, yet, when the Magistrates and other officers cease to do their duetie, they are as it were without officers, yea, worse then if they had none at all, and then God giveth the sworde in to the peoples hande and he himself is become immediately their head. [214]

Goodman's call for popular action, after the dereliction of duty by those to whom it chiefly belonged, is different from any other made hitherto by English Protestants. It is more specific than that in Bale's Faythfull admonycion of 1554 and is unconcerned with the constitutional rights of Englishmen which formed the basis of the appeal to the people found in Certayne Questions of 1555. It is bolder than any other tract to that date except the Shorte Treatise and it differed with that work in its fundamental assumptions.[215] Ponet's appeal to the people was based on a view of popular sovereignty grounded in the natural law. Goodman's was based solely in Scripture and was an appeal to a covenanted nation of the people of God.

When the Israelites took a vow before Moses, and promised to obey God in whatever He commanded, and to obey nothing that was not divinely sanctioned, they were creating a covenant which Goodman believed was still in force: "All Christians are no less bonde to obey God and his Lawes, then were the Israelites."[216] This covenant decreed disobedience by the people should they be commanded by their rulers to

commit ungodly acts. Goodman told his readers that "this hath God required of you, and this have you promised unto him not under condition (if the Rulers will) but without all exceptions to do what soever your Lorde and God shall commande you."[217] This disobedience could be carried to the point of tyrannicide should the ruler be an idolater, for God's law decreed that death was the penalty for all idolaters, including kings, and that the people were responsible for seeing this punishment executed, in the event of the magistracy shirking this duty.[218] The ruler, in such a case, was to be treated as any private citizen who had transgressed the law.[219]

Had England followed this doctrine in 1553 and slaughtered the Queen and the Catholic clergy, the country would have been spared the murder of so many saints and the misery it now suffered. However, despite the small numbers of the faithful that Goodman felt were likely to respond to his appeal, he thought that the realm might yet be delivered from idolatry. If the people repented their sins and, calling on God for a sign, looked about for someone to lead them, He would send them an apt man, as He had often done for Israel.[220]

Goodman then anticipated the rejoinder that, had God approved such a doctrine and such advice, the rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyatt would have been a success. He defended the godliness and patriotism of Wyatt and his men but concluded that the failure of the revolt

was only what England had deserved and that no discouraging conclusions should be drawn from it.[221] Goodman's view of Wyatt's enterprise, which had, after all, assiduously avoided appealing to any religious sentiment and had concentrated on appearing only as an anti-Spanish demonstration, shows how closely he linked the fate of England, a covenanted nation, with the maintenance of true religion. This was Goodman's assessment of Wyatt's motives for rebellion: "the zeale of Gods trueth and the pitie that he had to his Countrie, for the miserie he sawe to approache by the usurped power of ungodly Jesabell, and her merciles papistes the sawldiars of Antichriste...to defend the Gospel and his Countrie from cruel strangers and enemies."[222] This, said Goodman, also should have been the duty of <u>every</u> Christian. Goodman's concern for English security seemed to rest on its status as a covenanted nation, a land which must be preserved for the practise of true religion. His condemnation of Mary as a traitor, in these circumstances, was not meant to suggest that she was in violation of any treason statute, but that, as one who sought to place England in the hands of foreign idolators, she betrayed the covenanted people.

The sort of men among whom Goodman advised the people to seek for leadership were the various types of inferior magistrates -- mayors and aldermen in cities, constables and bailiffs in towns, and knights, justices and landlords in the shires. However should

these men prove corrupt or lax, unwilling to supply the needed leadership, and the great majority of the people show themselves uninterested in remedying their plight, Goodman does not urge any resistance and Superior Power ends on a surprisingly passive note. People were urged to persevere in the truth and either suffer martyrdom or flee into a suitable godly exile.[223] Whatever the choice the time for lip-service and hypocrisy had passed and the time for action had arrived.

Appended to Goodman's work was a poem, "William Kethe to the Reader", in which the author expressed in verse his approval of the concept of resistance. Kethe assured his readers that Goodman had brought forth a true doctrine which would teach: "how ill Rulers we ought to obeye/ Which kill, how, they care not, in their cruell rage/ Respecting their will more, then lawe, othe or charge."[224]

Echoing Luther and Bale, Kethe noted that rebellion was different from legitimate resistance. However the people seemed content to aid a nation that sought eventually to enslave them.[225] Should Goodman's wholesome doctrine be ignored, the faint-hearted people would deserve their fate.

The 1558 Works of John Knox

Early in 1558 the Genevan press of Poullain and Rebul published an anonymous tract entitled The First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstruous regiment of women. Basing its arguments on natural and

Scriptural law the book denounced the rule of women and called for the overthrow of all who reigned in violation of divine precept. Written by John Knox, a Scottish minister of the English congregation at Geneva, the work is perhaps the most famous and influential of the exile tracts. It provoked angry responses by both Catholic and Protestant alike over the next four decades, barred Knox from further participation in the English reformation, and soured relations between Elizabethan England and Geneva.

The Blast was the first of several of Knox's affirmations of the duty of resistance and was written only after years of uncertainty, and no little study of the subject, on the part of its author. Knox's own association with English Protestantism had come about as a result of his participation in an act of rebellion. After the 1546 assassination of Cardinal Beaton, which Knox described as a "godly fact",[226] Knox joined the insurgents in the besieged Castle of Saint Andrew's. On the Castle's surrender Knox was sent to the French galleys whence he was delivered in 1549 by the English court, who appointed him a licensed preacher.[227] During his English sojourn Knox's pronouncements on obedience did not go beyond the necessity of submission to civil authority save when commands were contrary to the will of God.[228] Mary's accession and her anti-Protestant policies prompted his flight to the Continent and it was there that Knox's long progress towards a bold defence of the right to

resist began.

The sight of England declining once more into superstition and idolatry prompted Knox to write a work which contained the germ of his later, more developed ideas on resistance.[229] This Godly Letter, completed in February 1554, claimed that the divine vengeance prophesied against England by godly preachers under King Edward would soon strike the realm if it did not halt its idolatrous ways. The covenant between man and God, by which the Lord promised to safeguard His people if they would serve Him truly, demanded obedience to His laws against idolatry.[230] The Deuteronomic penalty for worshipping strange Gods or for drawing away the people from God was death, without exception, lest divine wrath fall on the people. Knox claimed that the execution of this death sentence did not pertain to private citizens but rather to "everie Civill Magistrate within his realme".[231] All that was required of the people was the avoidance of religious abhomination and Knox urged his readers to stand firm in their faith.

Knox pursued his concern with the problems of obedience when he visited the Protestant clergy of Switzerland in March 1554. Knox's preoccupations are recorded in those Four Questions which Bullinger sent, with his answers, to Calvin.[232] The first two questions dealt with the legitimacy of rulers whose age or sex might render the title suspect. Knox asked first whether a male minor succeeding to the throne

could be regarded as the "lawful magistrate" and thus be obeyed by divine right. In this question Knox may have been referring to the claims made in the 1549 Western Rising where rebels maintained that the Edwardian Reformation was invalid because of the King's minority.[233] He then asked whether "a female can preside over, and rule a Kingdom by divine right, and so transfer the right of sovereignty to her husband?" This reference to Queen Mary and the fear of Spanish domination is plain. Knox then asked two questions about the justifiability of resistance: "Whether obedience is to be rendered to a magistrate who enforces idolatry and condemns true religion; and whether those authorities, who are still in military occupation of towns and fortresses, are permitted to repel this ungodly violence from themselves and their friends?" and "To which party must godly persons attach themselves, in the case of a religious nobility resisting an idolatrous sovereign?" On these latter two points, only the suggestion that the soldiery might take responsibility upon themselves for the defence of true religion had any novelty about it in the eyes of Continental Protestantism and Knox might well have expected an affirmative response from those he questioned. Of those who replied, we have only the responses of Bullinger and Calvin and these are cautious but not discouraging. On the grounds of English national custom Bullinger endorsed the legitimacy of the succession of Edward and Mary, pronouncing

"the gospel does not seem to unsettle or abrogate hereditary rights, and the political laws of Kingdoms."[234] He suggested that if the Queen proved to be a tyrant in the mould of Athaliah that God would, in his own time, provide a deliverer "to whom he will supply proper qualifications for this purpose". However, in response to Knox's third question Bullinger went a little farther and admitted that the resistance of the Armenians against their idolatrous Roman sovereign as recorded by Eusebius,[235] was not reproved and that Scripture "enjoins upon the magistrate a just and necessary defence".[236] Caution overtook Bullinger again after this admission and he warned against the dangers attendant on resistance when base motives and bad characters mixed themselves in with good causes. The role of the godly party, Bullinger decided, could not be determined in advance and was to be soberly decided with regard to "circumstances of place, time, opportunity, persons, and things", remembering that, in the end, God was "the only and the true deliverer".

Returning to Dieppe, Knox wrote to his "afflicted brethren in England". Telling them that he had travelled throughout Switzerland taking advice from pastors and other learned men, Knox stated that he had news as to "what may be done with a saif conscience in theis dolorous and dangerous dayes". He regretted that circumstances prevented him from telling them this news, but that he could safely say that "all is not lawfull nor just that is statute be Civill lawes, nether

yet is everie thing syn before God, whilk ungodlie person's alledgeis to be treasone."[237] This was hardly revolutionary and we must conclude that Knox's Swiss advice had set him back from the path to justifying resistance. His questions to Bullinger clearly indicate that Knox had embarked on his trip aware that resistance was worth considering and yet he had come back to argue in this same letter to his "afflicted brethren" that they were to patiently abide this "time of correction".[238]

Knox's uncertainty on this question was highlighted by his tract of July 1554 A Faythfull Admonition made by John Knox, unto the professours of Gods truthe in England. Here he accused the Catholic bishops of bloodthirsty butchery, compared Mary unfavourably to Athaliah and Herodias, accused her of being "an open traitoresse to the Imperiall crowne of England", and predicted that the Spanish marriage would result in the utter destruction of the realm. Yet Knox could not bring himself either to urge resistance or to pass favourable judgement on its permissibility.[239] He could only pray: "God for his great mercies sake stirre up some Phinees, Helias or Jehu, that the bloude of abhominable Idolaters may pacifie goddes wrath, that it consume not the hole multitude. Amen."[240]

By now Knox had considered many of the ingredients he was to use in the tracts of 1558 -- the belief that God's laws took precedence over man's, the idea of the covenant, the Scriptural penalties against idolatry,

and the responsibility of the magistracy for the reformation of religion. He had also taken advice on the legality of women's rule and the role of a rebellious godly nobility. Another element had been added by the time Knox wrote to "his sisters" in Edinburgh.[241] They had asked for his opinion on certain New Testament passages referring to female dress, and Knox in reply invoked Mosaic law to prove the inferiority of women in the natural order established by God. "The garmentis of women do declair their weaknes and unabilities to execute the office of men", he said. However if women "forgetting their awn weaknes and inabilitie to rule, do presume to tak upon thame to beir and use the vestementis and weaponis of men, that is, the offices whilk God hath assignit to mankynd onlie, they sall not aschaip the maledictioun of Him who must declair himself enemy, and a seveir punisser of all thois that be malicious perverteris of the order establissit by his wisdome."[242]

The doubt that Knox had about the justifiability of resistance finally disappeared in 1557. Having been invited to Scotland by nobles who vowed they were ready "to jeopard their lives and goods, for the setting fordward of the glorie of God",[243] Knox journeyed from Geneva only to be discouraged in his venture by letters he found waiting for him at Dieppe. The letters told Knox that new plans were being made in Scotland and that some of those who had been zealous for the Reformation now lacked boldness. It

was felt that Knox's presence in Scotland was not desirable. Disappointed and angry, Knox wrote a series of letters to nobles and his supporters in Scotland in which he asserted the responsibility of the inferior magistracy to reform religion and to defend their brethren from tyranny. They were to peacefully demand of the government either the promotion, or at least the toleration, of their religion and, if this were denied, they were themselves to provide for true preaching and the right administration of the sacraments. These actions were to be taken against even the chief ruler, but resistance was to be limited to the defence of religion only, and was to avoid worldly men and their motives.[244] The response of the Scottish Protestant nobility was to band together, swearing to maintain true ministers and the sacrament: "We shall maintain them, nourish them, and defend them, the whole Congregation of Christ, and every member thereof, at our whole powers and waring of our lives, against Sathan, and all wicked power that does intend tyranny or trouble against the foresaid Congregation."[245]

But before the news of the Scottish covenant reached Knox, he had begun, at Kieppe, his First Blast. He had been prompted to urge resistance by the Scottish inferior magistracy by the sight of a once-resolute nobility failing in its duty to advance the cause of true religion. Knox was now prompted to attack government by women by the sight of two realms imperilled,

by reason of their rulers' sex, to subjugation to foreign Catholic powers: "England for satisfying of the inordinat appetites of that cruell monstre Marie, (unworthie, by reason of her bloodie tyrannie, of the name of a woman) betrayed (alas) to the proude Spaniarde: and Scotland, by the rashe madnes of foolish governers and by the practises of a craftie dame, resigned likewise, under title of mariage, in to the power of France."[246] Knox had long been concerned with the phenomenon of female rule, as the question of 1554 and the letter to Edinburgh in 1556 show, and he had probably had discussions on it in 1557 with Calvin and Goodman.[247] The continuing persecution in England, the arrival of the critical hour for Protestantism in Scotland, and the European war which could only be disastrous to both British countries convinced Knox of the necessity of a bold and fundamental response.

Knox began his attack by a statement that re-emphasizes the alienation of the Genevan writers from their fellow exiles elsewhere in Switzerland and Germany:

> Wonder it is, that amongest so many pregnant wittes as the Ile of Greate Britanny hath produced, so many godlie and zealous preachers as England did sometime norishe, and amongest so many learned and men of grave judgement, as this day by Jesabel are exiled, none is found so stowte of courage, so faithful of that God, nor loving to their native countrie, that they dare admonishe the inhabitantes of that Ile, how abhominable before God, is the Empire or Rule of a wicked woman, yea of a traiteresse and bastard. And what may a people or nation, left destitute of a lawfull head, do by the authoritie of Goddes worde in electing and appointing common rulers and magistrates. [248]

Thus ignoring the works on these very topics that had issued since 1554 from the Protestant presses in London, Emden and Strasbourg, and implying that only he was sufficiently brave, pious and patriotic, Knox condemned English preachers and writers as negligent watchmen.[249] He then chose to present himself, in contrast, as one of God's prophets who would sound the warning about female rule despite dangers, accusations of sedition, and the likelihood that the offending parties would not amend themselves anyway.[250] He would pronounce women's rule to be the most detestable of all enormities and prove it, by reference to Scripture, natural law, and the opinions of the Church Fathers, to be against God's will, contrary to nature, and subversive of justice and order.

God had, in ordering his whole creation, made women unfit to bear rule. This was so evident that even those men guided only by "the light of nature" could see that this was true -- Aristotle, the Civil Law and historical chronicles were adduced as proof of this.[251] It was evident as well to the leaders of the early Christian Church. Augustus, Ambrose, Tertullian, Origen, Chrysostom, and Basilius Magnus were cited to prove the weakness and natural subordination of women.[252] These arguments, though they show us the breadth of his learning, were not the foundation of Knox's attack on women's rule. He had only included them because of the seeming novelty of his

thesis. Ignorance and the desire to please princes and the multitude had made men blind to the truth, necessitating his recourse to these sorts of examples to prove that Knox's view was no new thing.[253] His main arguments were drawn from Scripture,[254] where God's condemnation, after Eve's failing, of women in general, was buttressed by Paul's insistence that women keep silent and be in subjection. If a woman could not even speak in church how should she be allowed to rule over a whole nation?

Having shown that to place women above men offended God and nature, Knox turned to his proposition that gynocracy was "the subversion of good order, equity and justice". Knox maintained that God had given mankind two mirrors in which they could perceive His order: the human body and the Biblical state of Israel. A human body without a head, or with a false one would be considered monstrous, and so would a state with a woman at its head. The English and Scottish nobility in violating this order showed themselves to be worse than the brute beasts, who did not permit the lion to bow to the lioness or the hind to rule the harts.[255] The order which God assigned when giving laws to Israel expressly forbade a woman from ruling, as the Deuteronomic instructions on kingship showed. Only a man, and native-born one, was to be chosen as ruler.[256] These Mosaic injunctions were said to be as binding in Knox's day as they were in Old Testment times because they flowed from the

eternal Moral, rather than Ceremonial or Judicial, Law. That women's rule was repugnant to justice was easy for Knox to prove. Justice was defined as the will to give each his own right. As God had not given woman the right to reign over man, to allow a female rule was injustice.[257]

In considering possible objections to his thesis, Knox first examined two based on Scripture. Those who might proffer the examples of Old Testament female leaders such as Hulda or Deborah were reminded that these were exceptions against God's law, permitted by Him for some extraordinary and unfathomable reason. They could be no more used to sanction sixteenth-century female rule than Old Testament polygamy could be used to sanction having more than one wife. Moreover the new Athaliahs and Jezebels scarcely resembled those exceptional "godly matrons". The examples of the daughters of Zalphead who were permitted by Moses to inherit their father's land was rejected by Knox as having no relevance to whether a woman might succeed to the rule of a nation. In fact, as these daughters were forbidden to marry outside their tribe, the example seemed to speak against supporters of Mary Tudor and Mary Queen of Scots who had wed foreign tyrants. Knox echoed Bucer and Ponet in believing that God had not created the world to be ruled by a few great monarchs, or sanctioned aggression and aggrandizement. Realms won by marriage were thus unjust conquest.[258]

To the objection that long-standing custom and consent of the realm allowed women to inherit kingdoms, Knox opposed the primacy of Scripture, saying that "nether may the tyrannie of princes, nether the foolishnes of people, nether wicked lawes made against God, nether yet the felicitie that in this earthe may herof insue, make that thing lawfull which be by his word hath manifestlie condemned."[259] As God had forbidden women to rule, any queen regnant was a usurper and thus could not complain if deposed. It was now time for supporters of these queens (especially the inferior magistracy) to admit that they had been rebels against God and repent by refusing to serve them. Finally they were urged to repress the queens' "inordinate pride and tyrannie to the uttermost of their power" by removing those women and their adherents from office.[260] The Biblical fate of Athaliah was the example that Knox wished to see emulated -- inferior magistrates had bound themselves in an oath to depose a wicked queen and replace her with the rightful heir and ended by killing not only the queen but her idolatrous priests as well. It is important to note that Knox saw a role in this for the people as well as the magistracy, for they too were responsible for ensuring that the deposition was undertaken and the death penalty was pronounced and carried out against the monster and her defenders.[261]

Like Goodman, Knox had to deal with the possible question: if resistance is divinely-sanctioned, why

did those, such as Wyatt, who opposed a tyrannous queen fail? Knox encouragingly referred to the Israelites who failed twice in a just cause before triumphing over their foes, and speculated that God might have wished Mary Tudor's tyranny to become more manifest before He allowed her to be struck down. Knox predicted that Mary would not continue to reign for as long as she had hitherto done and maintained that the hour of vengeance was at hand.[262]

In The First Blast Knox advocated resistance against a regime headed by a woman, for reasons based overwhelmingly on Scripture. He continued to base his call for resistance on Biblical precepts in other works published at Geneva in 1558. The Appellation of John Knoxe From the cruell and most unjust sentence pronounced against him by the false bishoppes and clergie of Scotland, with his supplication, and exhortation to the nobilitie, estates and communaltie of the same realme [263] was his response to an attack on him by the Scottish Catholic clergy after his trip to his homeland in 1555-56. They had, after his departure for Geneva, served a notice for Knox to appear before them and, on his failure to comply, condemned him as a heretic and burnt him in effigy.[264] Using an appeal against this sentence as a starting point, Knox wrote The Appellation as an essay in the responsibilities of the inferior magistracy and the people in the reformation of religion. The first part of the tract was a letter to "The Nobilities

and Estates of Scotland". In it Knox outlined the injustice of his condemnation as a heretic and appealed to them for aid against the bishops and clergy, demanding a fair trial where his doctrine could be heard. He explained that the nobility had been given their power by God and that their chief duty was to maintain His true religion, punishing malefactors, ensuring their subjects were rightly instructed in religion, reforming abuses, and punishing those who deceived the people in religious affairs.[265] To possible objections that Knox's Old Testament examples supporting his contention did not apply to the Scottish nobility since they were neither Jewish nor chief rulers, Knox reaffirmed that God's commands applied in the Christian era to the inferior magistracy.[266] It was the duty of the nobility and the estates to protect the true church from the persecution of tyrants by active resistance if necessary. Such resistance was not only justifiable but a necessary fulfillment of their duties as magistrates; failure to execute this duty was itself treason.[267]

Though the inferior magistracy was first bound to act against religious tyranny in response to their vocation, the covenant between God and His people meant that the war on idolatry was the business of every man. This covenant, made in the time of Moses but still binding, obliged all men to punish idolatry by death.

If any go about to erect and set up idolatrie or

> to teach defection from God, after that the veritie hath bene receaved and approved, that then, not only the Magistrates, to whom the sword is committed, but also the People, are bound by that oth, which they have made to God, to revenge to the uttermost of their power the injurie done against his Majestie.[268]

The execution of the judgement varied with national circumstance. In cases where there was no considerable body of the faithful, such as in Israel after Jeroboam or in Catholic countries, action must wait upon God, who would perhaps send another Jehu. However in instances where the people had already received the true religion (though the majority may have back-slid), a different remedy was in order and the magistrates and the people themselves must act. As Edwardian England had taken an oath to maintain true religion, Englishmen found themselves in this category and Knox pronounced their proper course of action:

> And therfor I fear not to affirm, that it had bene the dutie of the nobilitie, judges, rulers and people of England, not only to have resisted and againstanded Marie, that Jesabel, whome they call their quene, but also to have punished her to the death with all the sort of her idolatrous Prestes, together with all such as should have assisted her, what tyme that shee and they openly began to suppresse Christes Evangil, to shedd the blood of the saincts of God and to erect that most divellish idolatrie, the papistical abominations and his usurped tyrannie which ones most justly by commune oth was banished from that realme. 269

The English failure to carry out this resistance was termed treason against God, Christ, and the liberty of their native realm. Knox therefore called on the Scottish nobility to live up to their responsibilities by allowing a fair trial and by defending him and the true religion, or to face the consequence of his

prophet's curse.[270]

Following the letter to the nobility and Estates in The Appellation, was a letter to "the communaltie of Scotland" in which Knox repeated his message that responsibility for the reformation of religion and the suppression of idolatry belonged to everyone. The basis of this responsibility was the equality of all men before the Gospel: "God requireth no lesse of the subject, be he never so poore, then of the prince and the riche man, in matters of religion.[271] Knox then required of the common people what he had demanded of the nobility, that they give his doctrine a fair hearing and protect him from the Catholic clergy. It was the right of the people to request of their rulers that the true doctrine be preached unto them and that false preachers be expelled, and, if this were not done, to take action into their own hands: "And if in this point your superior be negligent, or yet pretend to maintaine tyrantes in their tyrannie, most justly ye may provide true teachers for yourselves, be it in your cities, townes or villages: them ye may maintaine and defend against all, that shall persecute them."[272] Knox added that the people might also refuse to make financial payments to the clergy unless they provided the proper sort of ministry. Failure by the people to heed Knox's call would render them as guilty of the maintenance of idolatry as their bishops and rulers and leave them subject to God's revenge.

Attached to the two letters which formed the bulk of The Appellation was Knox's summary of his proposed Second Blast. Knox claimed that two reasons stayed his publication of this work. He said that many were offended at the first sounding of his trumpet against women's rule,[273] and also that a confutation of those principles had been promised. Until he was either successfully refuted or had a better occasion to speak out, Knox would simply publish four chief propositions in discharge of his conscience and to avoid any suspicions of what his silence might mean.[274] The propositions themselves suggest another reason why Knox was in no hurry to put them into print -- they were all contained in Goodman's Superior Powers. The first maintained, as Goodman had, that regal legitimacy stemmed not from lineage but from the consonance of the choice with divine precept. The propositions went on to claim no idolator or transgressor should be made king in a Christian realm and that should any unfit person have been chosen he might lawfully be removed from power and punished, any oath of loyalty notwithstanding.[275]

Anthony Gilby's An Admonition to England and Scotland to Call them to Repentance, noteworthy for its attack on Henry VIII as a "tyrant and lecherous monster" and its call on Britain to abolish idolatry, was also included between the covers of The Appellation.[276] Though not as explicit as Knox, Gilby was clearly in

sympathy with Knox's views as he attacked the rule of women and foreigners and urged prayer to the God of hosts and armies to provide the courage and means to destroy British idolatry.[277]

Just as Knox had appealed to the Scottish nobles and commoners for protection from the clergy and a trial of his doctrine, so too did he call on the ruler of Scotland, the Regent Marie de Guise, in The Copie of a Lettre Delivered to the ladie Marie, Regent of Scotland, frome John Knox minister of Goddes worde, in the year of our Lord 1556, and nowe augmented and explaned by the Author, in the yeare of our Lord 1558.[278] The work consisted of the text of a 1556 letter interlarded with additional comments by Knox, and it is in these additions that we find scattered parts of his resistance theories of 1558. Knox spoke of the dangers of unlawfull obedience, maintaining that "all is not repented before God, sedition and conjuration, which the foolish multitude so estemeth, nether yet is everie tumult and breatch of publike order contrarie to Goddes commandement."[279] He also told the Regent that he considered a woman's rule to be a sign of God's wrath and termed it a "usurped abuse". The belief that the civil authority had no business in the reformation of religion was attributed to Satan's influence. Only the fact that he was writing on this subject to the nobles and commons of Scotland prevented Knox from telling the Regent what was "the

dutie of magistrates and what power the people hath in such cases granted by God."[280]

In their opposition to women's rule and the rule of an infidel or idolater over a Christian realm, in their support of regal election in accordance with Scriptural precepts, and the advocacy of resistance by the inferior magistracy and the people in cases of religious oppression, Knox and Goodman are clearly a pair. Their theories on resistance bind them together and set them apart from the other writers of the Marian exile. This can be seen in their self-conscious alienation and their identification with the Truth above all other considerations. When Goodman wrote in defence of his work to Peter Martyr, who had witheld his approval, he knew his writings had offended his friends but said "we should aim at nothing with greater earnestness than the defence of the truth, whatever the controversy may be, or by whomsoever it may be taken up; whether they stand on our side as friends, or against us as avowed opponents...forasmuch as in the cause of religion, as you know, no third party is allowed, but we are required therein always to be either hot or cold."[281] Knox, in reply to John Foxe who had written to express his opposition to the First Blast, stated:

> My rude vehemencie and inconsidered affirmations, which may appear rather to procead from coler then of zeal and reason, I do not excuse; but to have used anye other tytle more plausible, therby to have allured the world by any art, as I never proposed, so do I not yet purpose: to me it is yneugh to say that black is not whit, and man's tyrannye and

> foolishnes is not Goddes perfite ordinance; which thing I do, not so much to correct common welthes as to delyver my own conscience, and to instruct the consciences of some simple, who yet I fear be ignorant in that matter. 282

Knox and Goodman opposed gynocracy, not because their opposition might win them converts or because they knew Princess Elizabeth to be Catholic,[283] but because the forbidding of women's rule seemed to be scripturally manifest and its fruits always bitter. In their alienation from the English reality, in defence of what they perceived to be the biblical truth, Knox and Goodman were zealous, courageous, and shortsighted.

Both the Genevans owed much to the influence of Continental Protestant resistance theory. Their reliance on the inferior magistracy, in the face of sad English experience, stemmed partly from Knox's hopes for Scotland but probably more to the writings of men such as Peter Martyr and Theodore Beza. In their desire for an elective monarchy and a role for the people in suppressing idolatry they had been preceded by Bucer and Zwingli.[284] However, in all, the Genevans were bolder than any of their Continental predecessors. Their concept of the inferior magistrate was wider and their view of the Deuteronomic code and the responsibility of the people more explicit than any European Protestant writer in the sixteenth century.

The relationship between the Genevans and the other English exile thinkers on the subject of resistance is that Knox and Goodman were more revolutionary

in one respect and less so in another. No other writers wished to alter the shape of political action and the English constitution so drastically as did Knox and Goodman. They would have swept away statute law and established customs in the manner of choosing England's king and replaced it with the election of a godly ruler based on Scriptural precept. Gone would be the rule of women, dynastic kingship, and the possibility of any but an enthusiastic Protestant of a particular type on the throne. No other Marian exile approached them in the advocacy of such breath-taking change. However, in one way, Knox and Goodman's writings of 1558 can be seen as a denial of, or perhaps a reaction to, that secular strain of resistance theory developed by earlier English exiles best represented by Bale, Ponet, and the author of Certayne Questions. To Knox and Goodman, tyranny was idolatry or irreligion and these were the only grounds for a justifiable resistance. To the representatives of the secular trend, tyranny could, in addition to idolatry and religious persecution, include theft, economic oppression, murder, a violation of the nation's constitution, or a threat to English law or custom. While both parties sanctioned an appeal to the people, the types of calls are different. Knox and Goodman called on Christians to eradicate idolatry and put to death the transgressors; Ponet and Certayne Questions also conceived of an appeal to Englishmen to rise in defence of home, country and constitution. It is the

difference between the resistance of the saint and that of the citizen.

Conclusion:

By December 1558 the news of Queen Mary's death had reached the Rhine valley and Switzerland. The exiles began to return to their native island, prepared for the most part, to put the propaganda war and thoughts of resistance behind them. They had, in several ways, advanced resistance theory; their writings were the boldest and clearest calls to revolution in all of Europe. The exiles had not only played a part in the political turmoil of Marian England but Continental Protestants with whom they had had close contact also went on to become stronger advocates of resistance.

The accession of a new Queen was, however, not the end of the association of English Protestants with resistance writings. The nature of obedience and obligation was to be hotly discussed again under Elizabeth and men who had been writers on the subject under Mary were to reach for their pens once more.

CHAPTER III: NOTES

1. Hughes and Larkin, Tudor Royal Proclamations, vol. II, p. 41; Acts of the Privy Council 1554-56, pp. 8,9, 11, 14, 19.
2. Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, vol. XII, ed. Royall Tyler (London: 1913), pp. 212-213, and 259. The Earl of Oxford was said to have been stopped on his way to the Parliament and begged by a number of Protestants to lead them. Ibid., p. 212.
3. Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, 1553-8, p. 79, and Garret, Marian Exiles, p. 105.
4. Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, vol. XII, p. 212 Though Pole sent his kinsman away, Stafford was not discouraged from his rebellious intentions as his invasion of England in 1557 testifies.
5. For publication data on the Faythfull admonycion and the arguments for attributing this work to John Bale see above, Chapter II.
6. Bale, Faythfull admonycion, Sig. A2. It is interesting that though Bale witheld Luther's name, he freely admitted Philip Melanchton's authorship of a preface to the same work. Although the exiles were harrassed by Lutheran authorities in Denmark, Wesel and Strasbourg, both Luther and Melanchthon were held in high regard by English Protestants. Ponet, for example, referred to Luther as that "worthy instrument of God", and to Melanchthon as one of his chief comforters in exile. Short Treatise, Sig. H7v; Robinson, ed., Original Letters, vol. I,

p. 116.

7. For the background to Luther's writing of his Warning, see above, Chapter I.
8. Bale, Faythfull admonycion, Sig. C4. The references to ancient privileges do not occur in Luther's original work and reflect one of Bale's major sorts of amendments, the insertion of references to Catholic threats against English law and custom.
9. Ibid., Sig. D.
10. Ibid., Sigs. D-D4. The term "rebel" was said to be more properly applicable to those like the lawless Anabaptists at Münster.
11. Ibid., Sig. E3v.
12. Ibid., Sigs. F-f2. Bale also uses this opportunity to castigate the "godles Spanyardes" who sought to bring England back under papal jurisdiction. Sig. F3v.
13. Ibid., Sig. I2-K. The emphasis on the dangers of alien usurpation here is Bale's, and is not in Luther's original.
14. Ibid., Sig. K.
15. Ibid., Sigs. D2v-D3.
16. Ibid., Sig. B4v.
17. Ibid., Sig. C. This story appears in I Kings 18.
18. Ibid., Sig. C. Skinner in The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, vol. II, p. 203, has shown that Melanchthon's argument can be traced to older civil law precepts.
19. Bale, Faythful admonycion, Sig. A4. Though he

principally blamed the nobility Bale also had harsh words for the slackness and ingratitude of the "inferior and meane sort".

20. Ibid., Sig. A4.

21. Ibid., Sig. A5-A5v.

22. The two principal exponents of the "alienation" factor in Marian exile theory are Michael Walzer and Paul Little. Walzer, in The Revolution of the Saints (New York: 1965), and "Revolutionary Ideology: The Case of the Marian Exiles", American Political Science Review, vol. 57, 1963, pp. 643-54, distinguishes between that majority of exiles whom he terms "Anglicans" and who chose to keep an "English face" on their refuge churches and the Genevan minority, "Puritans", who were fundamentally estranged from their country and its institutions. The "Puritan" exiles are described as impatient, radical and alienated, men whose experience has left them without social connections or sympathies, class or national loyalties. To such men, custom, reason or learning are unimportant as they have taken on the role of prophets of doom. Tyranny to an "Anglican", says Walzer, would be equated with robbery; to a "Puritan", tyranny is idolatry. Little, in his 1972 thesis "The Origins of the Political Ideologies of John Knox and the Marian Exiles" and "John Knox and English Social Prophecy", Journal of the Presbyterian History Society of England, vol. 14, 1970, pp. 117-27, seeks to blur Walzer's distinction and attribute a degree of alienation

to all the exiles. In his thesis (p. v) Little claims that "the acceptability of political resistance to the exiles was a function of their new political alienation." Exile radicalism then distinguished their ideas from those of the continental reformers. It is interesting however that the very first Marian resistance tract, published twice in 1554, is based directly on Continental Protestant thought and shows no evidence of alienation on the part of its author.

23. Loades, The Reign of Mary Tudor, chapter 10, is a good account of the Catholic religious reaction.

24. Acts of the Privy Council 1554-56, pp. 52 and 84 give the names of some, including a yeoman of the guard, involved in the distribution of lewd and seditious books.

25. Suffolk was the scene of an unsuccessful conspiracy in August 1554, Acts of the Privy Council, 1554-56, p. 65. In the next month there was talk of a plan to surround Hampton Court and murder the Queen and all the Spaniards inside, while in November a plot to assassinate Philip and Mary failed either through cowardice or frustrating circumstance. Loades, Two Tudor Conspiracies, pp. 142-44. Hostility against Philip's entourage soon reached such a state that a Spanish gentleman wrote:

> The country, it is true, is a good one, but we are surrounded by the worst people that ever lived, at any rate in a Christian land. The English hate us Spaniards, which comes out in violent quarrels between them and us, and not a day passes without some knife-work in the palace between the two

> nations. There have already been some deaths, and last week three Englishmen and a Spaniard were hanged on account of a broil. My own conviction is that were it not that our Lord is watching over us in answer to the ceaseless prayers and processions which letters we have received tell us are being held in Spain, we should all be dead by now.

Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, vol. XIII, pp. 60-61.

26. The authorship and place of publication of Certayne Questions has been a matter of speculation since the day of its importation into England in 1555. In the summer of that year the Privy Council sent its thanks to the Bishop of Durham and other Northern notables "for thier advertisements hither of a sedycious booke of questions in printe, and causing a Proclamation to be made in the parrishe churches for repressing of the same booke." Acts of the Privy Council, 1554-56, pp. 153-54. Bartlett Greene, a friend of exile Christopher Goodman and suspected of being linked in an assassination plot with him against the Queen, was questioned in mid-1555 about "certain printed papers of questions scattered abroad". The authorities were unable to substantiate either the alleged plot (suspicion having stemmed from a letter to Goodman in which Greene remarked, "the Queen is not yet dead"), or the connection to the tract and Greene was eventually executed on religious grounds. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. VII, pp. 715ff. More recently Patricia Took has speculated that Certayne Questions was not a product of 1555 but rather early 1554.

On internal evidence she has linked this tract with that one smuggled unsuccessfully into England from Danzig, and has suggested that this work "may represent the final fling of the Wyatt conspirators." The tracts discovered in Durham in the next year, she thought might be either remnants of the first edition or evidence of a second. "Government and the Printing Trade, 1540-1560", pp. 200-01, and 285. Typographical evidence now points to the Wesel press of Josse Lamphrecht as the place of publication, and internal evidence clearly points to the early months of 1555 as the time of composition. Question 37 in the tract refers to a second Parliament in a single year, one that received the pope's authority, a reference to the Parliament of 12 November 1554 - 16 January 1555. Whether the reference was to Parliament's supplication to Cardinal Pole on the last day of November or, what is more likely, to the various pieces of legislation which continued to be enacted into January, it is unlikely that news of these events could reach the exiles on the Continent and result in a finished tract before early 1555. A terminal date of February or March is suggested by the fact that the author does not mention the burning of Protestants which started in February 1555.

The question of authorship is utterly open and no possible writer has been suggested since Barlett Greene. It is therefore in a spirit of speculation

and with no confidence in the attribution that I suggest the name of John Hales as author of Certayne Questions. As will be shown, the author of the tract was a man acquainted with the law, concerned with Parliament and its usages and one interested in the common weal. Hales, former M.P., "commonwealth man", and experienced writer, had all these attrubutes and is known to have favoured resistance to Mary's regime. In his unpublished "Oration to Queen Elizabeth" he praised those Marian rebels who had gone about "to loose their brethren out of the yoke of this most miserable captivity." Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. VIII, p. 674. Another clue which might point to Hale's authorship is his continued attack on the legal validity of Mary's Parliaments, a feature of Certayne Questions. In both his "Oration", (p. 676) and his notorious tract in support of the Suffolk succession, Hales claimed that Mary's first Parliament was illegally constituted and that every Parliament from her third was invalid because the Queen had rejected the style of Supreme Head of the Church of England. "A Declaration of the Succession" in The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted, ed. George Harbin (London: 1713), p. xxiii.

27. Certayne Questions, Sig. A2v.

28. Mortimer Levine, Tudor Dynastic Problems, 1460-1571 (London: 1973), p. 163, prints the relevant parts of Henry's will.

29. Certayne Questions, Sig. A5.

30. Ibid., Sig. A2v. Though Becon's Humble Supplication of 1554 had complained of the unnaturalness of women's rule, and its predisposition to idolatry, this is the first attempts by an exile to use the Mosaic injunction against transvestism as an objection to the legitimacy of any female governor.

31. Bishop Latimer in 1549 had preached before the King citing Deuteronomy 17:15, "Do not set a stranger over thee", speaking of the dangers of Mary or Elizabeth wedding a foreigner and thus aiding the return of popery should they succeed to the throne. Corrie, ed., Sermons by Hugh Latimer, vol. I, p. 91. The same fear was expressed in Edwards' letters patent for the limitation of the crown which, ironically, aimed at setting up another female, Jane Grey, as his heir. Levine, Tudor Dynastic Problems, pp. 167-169.

32. Journals of the House of Lords, vol. I (London: n.d.), p. 453; Levine, Tudor Dynastic Problems, pp. 174-75.

33. During the Tudor period, both Mary and Elizabeth succeeded to the throne while still deemed illegitimate and Henry Fitzroy, Henry VIII's bastard, was considered a possible heir during the 1520's. On the other hand, Queen Jane, as we have seen, made much of Mary's bastardy in the official explanations of the Suffolk claim and Mary and Elizabeth both felt moved to have the taint of illegitimacy removed by Parliamentary action during their reigns.

34. Certayne Questions, Sigs. A2v and A6. Bishop Gardiner's claim that his Henrician decision about Mary's illegitimacy had been made in error drew this derisive question: "Item, whether the testimonie of a Bishop at large out of prison, enjoying all his dignities, openly in printe set forth to the whole worlde, be stronger agaynst the Kynges chyld, then when he beying deprived from all, and in prison, upon delyverye and restitucion by the same chylde, affyrmeth the contrary?"
35. Ibid., Sig. A2v.
36. Ibid., Sig. A2v. Elizabeth had been imprisoned in the Tower in early 1554 on suspicion of complicity in Wyatt's rebellion and later sent into house arrest at Woodstock. She was released only in the spring of 1555.
37. Ibid., Sigs. A2v-A3. The jurors were imprisoned for eight months and not released until substantial fines were paid. Throgmorton, despite his acquittal, was kept in prison until early 1555 and on his release became an exile in France. Loades, Two Tudor Conspiracies, pp. 97 and 158-9.
38. Certayne Questions, Sig. A3. The reference here is to those councillors who had originally taken Jane Grey's side and then escaped the consequences of their treason by going over to Mary. Cranmer was convicted of treason in November 1553, but was kept alive to be the subject of religious proceedings against him, eventually dying at the stake in 1556.

39. Ibid., Sig. A3. Mary originally spared Jane Grey despite her attempt at usurpation and had her executed only after Wyatt's Rebellion and the part played by her father, the Duke of Suffolk. It is to be supposed that it was this rebellion which was the "fault devysed and done by others".
40. Ibid., Sig. A3. The tract complained that the seizures took place before an exile was condemned or called home to answer to charges.
41. Ibid., Sig. A2v.
42. Ibid., Sig. A5.
43. Ibid., Sig. A3v.
44. Ibid., Sig. A4. "Item, whether the Cytizens of Andwerpe in requyring that no Spanyardes entre theyr cytie, give example to al men or not, to do the lyke. And whether the smart of other countreyes under the bondage and tyrannye of the spanyardes, where they have bene suffered to entre, dyd move the wyse sorte of Andwerpe to forsee theyr mischief."
45. Ibid., Sigs., A4v-A5. The threat to the native nobility, clearly influenced by the accounts of William the Conqueror which had appeared in English chronicles, appeared in the thirty-fifth question: "Whether William Conquerour destroyed all the nobilite of England for his own savegarde, by the counsell of Robart Archebishop of Canterbury, whom Kyng Herolde banished his Realme for treason. And whether it be lykely that in processe of tyme, the Prince of Spayne yf he be suffred, wyll doe the lyke

by the counsail of Stevan Gardiner, now Bishop of Winchester, or not." The connection between foreign interlopers and Bishop Gardiner is interesting in light of the treatise supposedly prepared by Gardiner for Philip. In this work on the means by which a foreign prince could win England, Gardiner is said to warn Philip that if foreigners are favoured over natives that he will find himself "continually in arms like the Spaniard in Milan and Naples, and he will end as the Danes in England." Peter S. Donaldson, ed., A Machiavellian Treatise by Stephen Gardiner (Cambridge: 1975), p. 133. Gardiner, in this work, far from plotting the destruction of the English nobility, is seen urging a policy of mercy, affability and generosity.

46. Loades, The Reign of Mary Tudor, pp. 223 and 234.

47. Certayne Questions, Sigs. A4v and A5v-A6.

48. Ibid., Sig. A3v. Philip had earlier been betrothed to a Portugese princess.

49. Ibid., Sig. A6. This astonishing suggestion was repeated by other exiles and was echoed in actual charges of just such "lyke practyse" in England in 1555. Foxe tells the story of Isabell Malt who, giving birth to a boy in June, claimed to have been approached by Lord North who asked her to part with her child, presumably for the purpose Certayne Questions suggested. Foxe, Acts and Martyrs, vol. VII, p. 126. A woman, Alice Perwiche, was tried in August, 1555 for saying that Mary's child would be

a substitute. Calendar of Patents, Philip and Mary, vol. III (London: 1938), p. 184. The rumour of the false child was reported to have been circulating in Hampshire in March 1555. Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, vol. XIII, p. 147.

50. Certayne Questions, Sig. A3v. If John Hales were the author of the tract, this statement would be in accordance with his association with "commonwealth" sentiment under Edward VI. Hales had been accused of stirring the commons against the nobility for their selfishness. John Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, 3 vols. (Oxford: 1822), vol. III, no. 1, p. 150.

51. Certayne Questions, Sig. A6.

52. Ibid., Sig. A3-A3v. Violation of one's oath was a repeated theme in this tract. Parliamentarians were said to have perjured themselves in breaking their oath "never to receyve the Bishop of Rome agayne". The Queen had allegedly violated hers in breaking her promise to tolerate Protestantism and in seeking to diminish the realm. Philip broke his in demanding to be crowned. The tract bitterly asked "whether it be a common maxime, or generall rule, practysed amongest princes, yf they maye at anye tyme breake theyr fayth, and forsweare themselves, for the purchasing or obtayning of a Kingdom." Sig. A4v.

53. Ibid., Sigs. A3-A4. The errors of the Marian regime in religious matters are frequently attacked

in Certayne Questions. "Item, whether all such as in religion followe the commandement of man shalbe damned with the man that commaundeth yf he commaunde it, that is contrary to the law of God?" The tract went on to affirm the importance of religious instruction in English, to defend Scripture from those calling it "the fountayne of heresies", and to abuse the Pope and his English bishops.

54. Ibid., Sig. A5-A5v. Professor Conrad Russell tells me that this reference to two Parliaments in one year is a misreading of a statute of Edward III and that, in this regard, the author of Certayne Questions was either a poor historian or a liar.

55. Ibid., Sig. A5. This objection seems to have been grounded on the terms of the English coronation oath. However, the tract's referenes to Parliament and the power of its statutes were not exclusively critical, as the author could make good use of them when it suited his needs. In one place he suggests that the Queen cannot marry against the wishes of the House of Commons and in another he proclaims it treasonous, by the laws of Parliament, to publish a royal pedigree showing that Philip had his own claim, through blood, to the English throne. Ibid., Sigs. A5 and A3v.

56. Ibid., Sig. A2.

57. Ibid., Sigs. A4v-A5. Aside from the violation of her coronation oath, it is difficult to see in what way Mary's alleged diminution of the realm

broke the "lawes of God, and of nature". As the claims to popular deposition power were made in the context of constitutional usage, this appeal to divine and natural law might be seen as implicit affirmation of the consonance of traditional English practice (which Mary sought to overcome) with such law.

58. There is in Certayne Questions only one reference to what might be considered the powers of the inferior magistrate and one that highlights the contrast between the European view of such powers and the English perception. While Calvin had spoken of the duties of the Estates, and the German reformers looked to the powers of city-states and imperial Electors, Certayne Questions had in mind a category of officers somewhat less elevated. It appealed to "the cheff Captayn and sodiars of any towne, Castelle or holde" not to obey the orders of any prince who sought to turn their charge over to a foreigner or to leave it desolate "to the destruction of the realme". Ibid., Sig. A2. It is significant that it was just this sort of person who featured prominently amongst the Dudley plotters and other conspirators based in France.

59. Professor Skinner in The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, vol. II, chapter 7, shows how this belief had become a commonplace in the resistance writings of Continental Reformers. This natural law doctrine had already appeared in Marian

exile literature in Bale's Faythfull admonycion.

60. Certayne Questions, Sig. A3v.

61. In saying this I am aware of the implications of the author's citation of Deuteronomy to bar women from the succession. This argument is, however, atypical of the whole tract with its emphasis on English law and custom, and represents a train of thought only beginning among the exiles and which did not reach full maturity and self-awareness until 1558.

62. There is a notable similarity between the list of oppressive acts which Certayne Questions ascribes to Mary, and the articles setting out the tyranny of Richard II and described in Edward Halle's chronicle. Like Mary, Richard was said to have committed extortion, levied charges of treason against innocent notables, received the authority of the Bishop of Rome, broken promises and the coronation oath, ruled according to his will, and not the law, and had murder committed. The Union, ff. 6v-8. Within a few months of the production of Certayne Questions, Halle's chronicle was banned by royal proclamation, the only work of its sort specifically mentioned. Hughes and Larkin, Tudor Royal Proclamations, vol. II, p. 58.

63. The one way in which Faythfull admonycion might be seen as more advanced than Certayne Questions is in its implicit approval of individual tyrannicide which appeared in the translation of Melanchthon's

preface and discussion of which is absent in the 1555 tract.

64. Because a sermon by Heinrich Bullinger was appended to the treatise the authorship of the whole book has sometimes been ascribed to him, and the place of printing to Zürich. However Martyr's responsibility is quite obvious when the tract is compared to his larger commentaries on the Book of Judges, published later.

65. This theory was becoming commonplace among Continental reformers and had received the very recent approval of the French Protestant Theodore Beza in his De Haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis (Geneva: 1554), a widely-read work defending Calvin's proceedings against Servetus. In comparison to Beza's work however, Martyr's is the clearer and bolder exposition.

66. The translation of the work is ascribed by the Short Title Catalogue to Thomas Becon, but a case could also be made for John Jewell or Christopher Goodman. Jewell, according to his fellow exile and biographer Laurence Humphrey, attended Martyr's lectures and recorded them in shorthand. Anderson, Peter Martyr, p. 177. Goodman certainly had close contact with Martyr in Strasbourg, living with him for a time and eventually publishing a defence of inferior magistrate power of his own in 1558. It seems probable that the work represents the views of a great many exiles in Strasbourg and Zurich,

where Martyr moved in 1556, accompanied by a number of devoted Englishmen, as Martyr's opinion was widely sought throughout Mary's reign.

67. The Cohabitacyon, f. 16.

68. Ibid., f. 48.

69. Ibid., f. 50.

70. Ibid., f. 48-48v. The designation of the rebellious Maccabees as inferior magistrates was not one with which all exile writers agreed. In his Shorte Treatise, John Ponet treated the leading Maccabee's actions as an example of tyrannicide by a private citizen. Sig. H6v.

71. The Cohabitacyon. F. 50.

72. Ibid., f. 48. The tract does point out that some matters, seemingly in the civil sphere, may involve a religious scruple and thus warrant disobedience and resistance.

73. Ibid., f. 51v.

74. Such was the view of Martyr's biographer Marvin Anderson who in "Royal Idolatry: Peter Martyr and the Reformed Tradition", Archiv für Reformations-gesichte, vol. 69, 1978, pp. 157-200, considered that the lectures from which The Cohabitacyon was drawn were meant to cool the hotter heads among the English exiles. He cites Knox's famous "Four Questions" to the Swiss reformers on resistance in 1554, the preparation of Ponet's Short Treatise in 1556 and Goodman's Superior Powers of 1558 as prompting Martyr to respond directly with his lectures.

However the latter two works were written after the publication of The Cohabitacyon and Knox's questions dealt with exactly the sort of resistance by godly magistrates that Martyr approved of, so it is difficult to see how Anderson's argument can be sustained. Since Martyr's previous utterances on resistance had all been negative the exiles most probably saw his new-found advocacy as an encouraging conversion.

75. Jane Dawson, "Christopher Goodman", p. 218, thinks that Goodman's starting point in resistance theory might well have been Martyr's The Cohabitacyon.

76. As with many other anonymous exile works, details of its publication have long been a matter for speculation. Its place of printing has now been ascribed by the revised Short Title Catalogue to the Emden press of Egidius Van Der Erve. Foxe claimed that the book's arrival prompted both a rigorous search by the Wardens of every City Company and the publication of the proclamation against heretical books of 13 June 1555. In these assertions he was backed by Strype. Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. VII, p. 127, and Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, vol. III no. 1, p. 418. This view has recently been challenged by Youngs in Proclamations of the Tudor Queens, p. 200, and "The Tudor Governments and Dissident Religious Books", p. 173. Youngs believes that the proclamation of June 1555 was occasioned by the mysterious Dialogue, 1000 copies of which

were seized, and not by A Warnyng which he dates before the royal marriage of 25 July 1554. Youngs, in fact, is correct in believing the work could not have prompted the proclamation. This is, however, not because the tract predates the proclamation by over a year but because it was written several months after, as internal evidence clearly shows. A Warnyng is full of clues as to its date of origin. It speaks of a Neopolitan Pope, which must refer to Giovannie Pietro Carafa, elected as Paul IV in May 1555. There is reference to the end of hopes for Mary's pregnancy, acknowledged in July, and of the departure of Philip which occurred in late August. Since the tract appears aimed to coicide with the October Parliament, a date of September 1555 for A Warnyng seems most probable. The work, distributed in great numbers, cited the example of Naples and Milan where the rule of the Spanish had proved oppressive, "the author warning the English, to whom the book is dedicated, that the like will befall tham also, and that they must also look to it whilst there is yet time." The ambassador noted that the City Companies had been called upon to ascertain its place of publication and authorship but it was suspected to have originated in Strasbourg, "from the English who are there, and endeavour by all means to make the people here rebel against the present government." Calendar of State Papers, Ventian, 1555-56, ed.

Rawdon Brown (London: 1877), vol. VI, part 1, pp. 269-70.

As to the authorship of the pamphlet, only a guess is possible. The Short Title Catalogue of German Books from 1455 to 1600 now in the British Museum (London: 1962), p. 269, has attributed the work to Bishop John Ponet and among Ponet's works listed in Bale's Scriptorum Illustrium, p. 694, is one entitled "Praemonitionem ad Anglos". This Latin title, however, refers more probably to Ponet's Shorte Treatise, which has a final chapter entitled "An Exhortation or rather a warnyng to the Lordes and Commones of Englande", and which was later referred to by the Marian exile Robert Crowley as Ponet's "admonition to England". An answere for the Tyme (London: 1566), p. 39. A better guess is that of Patricia Took who, in "Government and the Printing Trade, 1540-1560", p. 267, nominated Sir Anthony Cooke, or someone in his household, as author of A Warnyng. The tract displays a recent knowledge of conditions in Italy and Cooke had just returned to Strasbourg from Padua in the summer of 1555.

77. Loades, The Reign of Mary Tudor, pp. 227 and 269.

78. A Warnyng, Sig. A2. This saying of "The Poet" appears to be a rendering of that line which Bale, in his Vocacyn, f. 44, attributed to Horace, and which also appeared on the title page of Certayne Questions: "Felix quem faciunt aliena pericula

causum."

79. A Warnyng, Sigs. A5-A6v.

80. Ibid., Sig. A7.

81. Ibid., Sig. A7.

82. Ibid., Sig. A2.

83. S.T. Richards, ed., Secret Writings in the Public Records, p. 9.

84. John Bradford, The Copye, Sig. A4. He specifically mentions, among these "pestiferous" works, A Supplicacyon to the Quenes Majestie, now attributed to John Ponet.

85. Bradford's protestations of religious orthodoxy have been the subject of some debate and must still be open to question. Whether his contemporaries judged him a loyal Catholic is not known, but four decades later when England was again threatened by Catholic Spain the Puritan Sir Francis Hastings drew attention to Bradford's warnings. In A Watch Word (London: 1598), pp. 91-98, and An Apologie or Defence of the Watch-word (London: 1600), pp. 203-206, Hastings noted that Spanish designs on England had been exposed, in the time of Mary, by John Bradford, a Papist, motivated not by "hatred to Poperie" but by patriotism. Among modern historians David Loades seems most willing to believe in Bradford's religious avowals. In "The Authorship and Publication of The Copye", Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Soceity, vol. 3, 1960, pp. 155-160, Loades sees the tract as an example of Catholic

opposition to a Catholic government, and, though he seems less convinced in the 1979 The Reign of Mary Tudor, he still takes at face value Bradford's concern that he not bethe promoter of heresy (p. 470). Others have doubted Bradford's claims. Christina Garrett in The Marian Exiles, p. 97, speaks of the tract's "Catholic disguise" while William S. Maltby in The Black Legend in England (Durham, N.C.: 1971), p. 29, calls Bradford a Protestant and his tract "a clumsy attempt to turn popular distrust of strangers to the purpose of religious reform."

There is some evidence in The Copye of a letter to show that the work was not what it purported to be in religious terms. Despite Bradford's claim that he was ignorant in matters of divinity his statements on doctrine, particularly those found on Sigs. C1v-C5v, are excrutiatingly ambiguous and there are overtly anti-Catholic elements. When, for example, the tract speaks of the purity and perfection of the mass, a marginal note reads "Mark this lye". Appended to the main body of the text is a poem entitled "A tragicall blast of the Papisticall trompette for maintenaunce of the Popes Kingdome in Englande" whose chorus runs "Now all shaven crowns to the standard/ Make rome, put down for the Spaniard", Sigs. G7 ff. This, coupled with Bradford's predilliction for irony, suggests that the author's claims of Catholic orthodoxy

must seriously be doubted.

86. "I have written my name plainly that I may thereby eyther give your lordeshippes warning...(or) else that I may goe honestlye to the galowes." The Copye, Sig. C7v.

87. Christina Garrett's The Marian Exiles, p. 97, identifies this man as Sir William Skipwith, the father-in-law to the Wyatt rebel and exile Sir Peter Carew, and suggests that it was he who insinuated Bradford into the household of the Duke of Medinaceli. However there is no evidence to link Skipwith to Bradford's spying; nor is it certain that it was Medinaceli who employed Bradford.

88. The Copye, Sigs. B1v-B2. Bradford concluded, in mock rue, that while it was a "noble thing" to have one's womenfolk sexually used by the King, "the worst of all the companie must have my wife privelie."

89. Ibid., Sigs. D2v-D3.

90. Ibid., Sigs. D4, D7-D8, F3, and F4. Bradford names nobles such as the four Earlsand Lords Grey and Clinton whom the Spanish would eliminate and accuses Lord Paget of being the Spaniards' tool.

91. Ibid., Sigs. F1-F2v. These passages are extremely reminiscent of A Warnyng.

92. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic - Mary, ed. Robert Lemon (London: 1856) p. 83, in an examination of a London brick-layer, noted the rumour that the Earl

of Pembroke was to get the crown from the Earl of Shrewsbury and crown Philip, and a Venetian observer reported that Mary hoped to achieve her husband's coronation with the aid of a few nobles. Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, VI, (1), p. 227. In May, 1556, Lord Paget was reported in Brussels reasurring the Spanish that in future "the authority they exercised in England would be of a different sort to what they have had there hitherto." Ibid., p. 445.

93. The Copye, Sig. F3v. Bradford, a man who earlier professed himself of no learning or knowledge, followed this constitutional judgement designed to thwart any extra-Parliamentary coronation, with a citation from Erasmus forbidding princes from ruling for their own benefit to the detriment of the commonwealth..

94. Ibid., Sig. F4v. Bradford did admit that if Mary were the last surviving heir then she might, by God's law, dispose of the crown to whomever she wished.

95. Ibid., Sig. F4v.

96. Ibid., Sigs. G4v and A4v. It might be argued, in assessing the tract's resistance content, that exhortations against sedition (Sig. G5) and pretending any evil against the Queen (Sig. D6v), outweigh these other statements. However it must be considered that resistance offered to any plan to crown Philip would necessarily involve the Queen. That Bradford

meant the tract to be taken to sanction active resistance if necessary can be seen by Bradford's own actions.

97. This second edition has been identified by David Loades in "The Authorship and Publication of The Copy etc." with that printed in Strype's Ecclesiastical Memorials, vol. III, no. 2, pp. 339-354. Loades has shown how John Capstocke and three others were apprehended in March 1557 for the production of anti-government literature including "a malicious false and scandalous book entitled The Copie of John Bradfords letter to the Queen and to the lordes and estates of the realme of England." This version of the tract was substantially changed from the original, the differences explained by Loades as being revisions meant for a Protestant readership. While it is true that Bradford's ambiguous doctrinal pronouncements were excised, and his references to "heretics" and their "many abominable heresies" become "Protestantes" and their "new fangled faythe", there are many other changes which cannot be explained by religious criteria. The second edition is shorter, less ambiguous and far less extravagant than the original. Bradford's bawdy rhyming prose and the appended anti-clerical poem were eliminated and Bradford's claim that Philip had five or six women per night was reduced in the second edition to a mere three or four. The essence of Bradford's argument against Philip's

coronation is retained and again the authority of the Spaniard's own letters is cited; in fact in the second edition they appear to be quoted rather than paraphrsed. The people are again urged to take united action and the nobility to do such things as would redound to God's glory and the safety of their families, lands and honour. The timing of the tract, which may never have reached print, suggests a connection with the Stafford invasion. If this is the case it is not impossible that John Bradford was connected with both editions of The Copye.

98. Despite assertions by both Christina Garrett, The Marian Exiles, p. 97, and David Loades, "The Authorship and Publication of The Copye", p. 156, there is nothing to link Bradford with the Dudley plot of 1555-56. Their citation of the "Baga de Secretis", Fourth Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, p. 258, can refer only to his participation in the Stafford conspiracy of 1557.

99. Stafford's maneuverings in France were closely watched by Mary's agents and may be followed in the Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, 1553-58.

100. Stafford's proclamation is printed in Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, vol. III, no. 2, pp. 515-18.

101. There are extracts, almost verbatim, from Bradford's Copye in the proclamation and in it Stafford announced that his actions had been prompted by news of Spanish plots revealed in certain letters. The govern-

ment itself made the link between Stafford's invasion and the tract war in a proclamation issued shortly after the affair. Certainly referring to Bradford's book among the other tracts written in the same vein, the proclamation accused the Stafford men of "sendinge hither into the realme divers bokes, letters and writinges, bothe printed and written, farced and filled full of untruthes and sedition, and most faulse surmyses of thinges sayde to be done and divised by the Kinge oure soverene Lorde, and his servantes, which were never imagined or thought." Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, vol. III, no. 2, p. 513.

102. Ibid., p. 516.

103. Despite his previous pretensions to the royal succession, Stafford, in his proclamation limited himself to seeking the restoration of his "bloude and howse to the owlde pristinate estate" and hoping that the commons would view him as their "protector, governor and defendor". He vowed that he did not seek to work his own advancement to the succession and spoke of preserving the crown to the rightful heirs. Ibid., pp. 517-18.

104. A pro-government ballad by John Heywood, entitled The trayterous taykinge of Scarborow Castell (London: 1557) boasted: "A few false traytours can not wynne a realme/ Good subjectes be (and will be) trew as steele/ To stand with you, the ende they lyke no deele." Nor did Stafford's defeat seem

to arouse much grief among his fellow exiles. According to Wotton, Henry Dudley and his men laughed at Stafford's undertaking, calling him "King of Scarborough". Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, 1553-58, p. 306.

105. The revised Short Title Catalogue attributes one edition to the Egidius Van Der Erve press at Emden and the other to John Kingston and Henry Sutton for John Wayland in London, but see Chapter II for an objection to the latter. The edition cited here is the "London" version.

106. Lippomanno, bishop, scholar and diplomat, had been sent to Poland in 1556. A former president of the Council of Trent, Lippomanno was known for the harshness of his attitude to Protestants. Though I have found no trace of a "Peter Conterini", the Contarinis were a prominent family in sixteenth-century Venice.

107. Michael Throckmorton was a long-time associate of Pole's and a firm Catholic, rewarded, under Mary, for his devotion by repeal of his earlier attainder and outlawry and the grant of a manor by the Queen. Journal of the House of Commons, vol. I (London: 1803), p. 40.

108. Two things suggest this. Firstly, Lippomanno and the situation of the Polish Protestants seem rather remote topics to have inspired an English tract. Secondly the "Throckmorton" preface speaks of Lippomanno's practises being revealed "with the

displayeng of his secretes in sundry tongues". A verye fyne Letter, Sig. A2. An English exile may well have seen the opportunity to attack his country's Catholic clergy by adding the two prefaces to an existing Continental Protestant tract.

109. Ibid., Sig. A5v.

110. Ibid., Sig. A2v.

111. Ibid., Sigs. Av-A2.

112. Five Edwardian bishops had been burnt by mid-1556: Hooper of Gloucester in February 1555, Ferrar of St. David's in March 1555, Latimer of Worcester and Ridley of London in October 1555, and Cranmer of Canterbury in March 1556. Other clerical leaders who had perished included John Bradford, Lawrence Saunders, John Philpot, and Rowland Taylor.

113. The conspiracy of Henry Dudley, an ambitious plot involving a raid on the Mint, an invasion from France and the deposition of Mary, was betrayed in March 1556. Loades, Two Tudor Conspiracies, the best account of this enterprise, notes (p. 96) how Dudley's men appeared influenced by arguments used by writers of resistance tracts. It was reported that one of them "began to discors of the order of Napoles, how that thayr nobility and gentelmen were browt to confusyon and the commons to slaveri, saying yf God were not marcyfull to us ...it is lyke to come to the same passe if the Kyng be here crowned." The violation of the will of Henry VIII, which Certayne Questions had claimed

warranted Mary's deposition, was also seized upon by Dudley who planned to publish the will once his uprising had begun.

114. Christina Garrett, in The Marian Exiles, pp. 106-7 and 114-17, presents the interesting thesis that the kidnapping was aimed at capturing Cheke, who she believes was the director of exile propaganda, and was arranged by Carew to secure his safe return to England.

115. Indications of this can be seen in those exiles applying for citizenship in their cities of refuge, buying property, and deciding to learn the local language. Patrick Collinson, Archbishop Grindal (London: 1979), p. 69, notes that by 1555 it was not possible to envisage the prospect of a Protestant settlement within four years, and that Grindal's study of German was motivated by despair.

116. Published by the Köpfel press at Strasbourg, the work was yet being written in May 1556 as Ponet mentioned the Cheke kidnapping, Short Treatise, Sig. 17. It seems to have been published shortly after the author's death in August of that year, the introduction claiming that the printer "is not sure, whether the autor begone to God allready...or yet still in this life". Sig. Av.

117. An excellent introduction to Ponet's life and works is Winthrop S. Hudson's John Ponet (1516-1556): Advocate of Limited Monarchy (Chicago: 1942). Educated at Cambrdige, where he first incurred the

emnity of Stephen Gardiner, Ponet rose to prominence in the Edwardian church, writing several theological works, and becoming in turn, Bishop of Rochester and Winchester. Deprived of his see on the accession of Mary, Ponet joined in Wyatt's rebellion before fleeing to Strasbourg. In exile, he continued to write, producing works on priestly marriage and the Eucharist as well as seditious tracts.

Quentin Skinner in his Foundations of Modern Political Thought, vol. II, Chapter 7, terms Ponet a "radical Calvinist". This is not a very helpful label, and is perhaps misleading. Whatever theological opinions Ponet may have shared with Calvin, their views on resistance are very far apart. Moreover on two important occasions in the development of the English Church Ponet seems to have sided with the "established" rather than the more "godly" faction, as his role in the Edwardian affair of John Hooper's scruples on vestments and the Marian troubles at Frankfurt testify. A.G. Dickens, The English Reformation, p. 391, terms Ponet "an anti-Calvinist Anglican".

118. Ponet's expression of the natural law found in the Shorte Treatise was that he had earlier outlived in his Edwardian A Short Catechisme ff. 10-11 and 67.

119. Ponet, Shorte Treatise, Sig. A3. Paul Little in "John Knox and English Social Prophecy", pp. 121-22, seeks to equate Ponet with John Knox in a supposed

advocacy of resistance for primarily religious grounds, and, to bolster this claim, argues that this passage in Shorte Treatise refers to the "scriptural law of God" as the touchstone. (The emphasis is mine.) This is a fundamental mistake as Ponet is, in fact, referring to a natural law, universally accessible, engraved even in the hearts of Ethnics (pre-Christian-era men). Certainly men's sinful nature necessitated the law's expression in writing but it is still perceptible enough by non-Christians for them to act by it. To equate Ponet's view of the Decalogue and Golden Rule as the measure of an act's justice with Knox's much more sweeping view of scriptural competence is to misunderstand both men's writings.

120. Ibid., Sigs. A4v-A5. Ponet listed Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy as various forms of rule but noted that mixed government of king, nobles and commons had been judged the best and most conducive to stable rule.

121. Ibid., Sig. A5.

122. Ibid., Sig. B4.

123. Ibid., Sig. B5v. This passage on things indifferent has been misunderstood by both Paul Little in "John Knox and English Social Prophecy", pp. 121-22, and Gordon Zeeveld, Foundations of Tudor Policy, p. 266. Both seem to believe that Ponet's phrase "maters indifferent" must mean something very much like "adiaphora", things theologically indifferent or

not necessary for salvation, and that Ponet gives princes a free hand in such affairs. Little concludes that Ponet's chief concern is thus with Marian violations of scriptural law, while Zeeweld thought that, as Ponet had agreed with royal control of things indifferent, his quarrel with the Marian regime was only over its violation of essential doctrine. While Ponet is concerned, and deeply, with tyranny in religious affairs, this passage of his cannot be used to explain away Ponet's immense concern with secular tyranny. Firstly, this phrase "maters indifferent" refers to those things which have no great effect on the commonwealth, for either good or evil, but which are done only "for a decent ordre" and not necessarily to those things which did not affect the soul's well-being. Secondly, this inconsequential latitude which Ponet allows princes does not apply to most rulers but only to those whom Ponet labelled tyrants, whose countries had yielded to them the power to make law unrestrained by others. Thus Ponet's meaning here is not to surrender the secular realm to the will of princes but only that certain rulers have a constitutional right to legislate freely in certain rigidly prescribed areas of little importance.

124. Ponet, Shorte Treatise, Sig. C5-C5v.

125. Ibid., Sig. D6.

126. Ibid., Sig. D7.

127. Ponet noted that Reginald Pole, or "Carnal Phoole"

as he styled him, had said that there was no lack of examples of deposition in England. Ponet's reference here is to Pole's Defence of the Unity of the Church, an edition of which had been published in Strasbourg in 1555 to discredit its author.

128. Ponet, Shorte Treatise, Sigs. G3v-G4. Skinner, Foundations, vol. II, pp. 227-28, believes that Ponet was forced to use conciliarist arguments "anxiously" and "with copious apologies". It seems clear however that, far from being trapped into using the arguments of his opponents, Ponet delighted in turning his foes' words back on themselves. There was, after all, no need for him to use conciliar deposition theory as scripture and history abounded in examples. It appealed to Ponet's Protestant sense of humour, as well as making an extremely telling point, to show that his Catholic enemies, who were now preaching obedience, were heirs to a doctrine which sanctioned the deposition of the Pope himself. Arguments from canon law, conciliar theory and church history are used, and freely acknowledged by Ponet all throughout the Shorte Treatise. See Sigs. C7-C7v, D5-D6v, E3v, G3-G5, and H3v-H4v.

129. Ibid., Sig. G6.

130. Ibid., Sigs. Cv and G3v.

131. Ibid., Sig. A6v. This passage suggests the influence of Calvin's Institutes IV, 20, 30.

132. Ponet, Shorte Treatise, Sig. G5v. Ponet probably

drew his view of the Constable's office from Thomas Starkey's Dialogue.

133. Ibid., Sig. H.

134. Ibid., Sig. G7-G7v. This view is reminiscent of John Hooper on the origins of the nobility in his A Declaration of the Ten Holy Commandments. Samuel Carr, ed., Early Writings of Bishop Hooper (London: 1843), p. 363. In this work, and in his commentary on Romans, Hooper stated a number of points which Ponet echoed in the Shorte Treatise, e.g., that princes should be bound by their own laws and that princes who killed unlawfully should be treated as murderers. Ponet may also have taken his citation of the views of Trajan on tyranny from Hooper.

135. Ibid., Sig. I. Like the author of Certayne Questions, Ponet declared it a firm principle in the minds of great men that "to come by a kingdome, to com by that they desire, they maye breake all mennes lawes, all othes, all promises, yea the lawes of God and honestie." Like Bradford, Ponet expressed astonishment that nobles who betrayed their country could think that those for whom they had practised treachery would every trust them, and likened such traitors to poisons that, once used, were consigned to the dung heap.

136. Ibid., Sigs. I3-I8. Among those mentioned were the Duke of Northumberland, Bishop Gardiner, Lords Paget, Arundel and Wriothesley, Sir John Mason and the Councils of Edward and Jane. It is important

to note particularly the latter for it was not just Mary's Catholic supporters with whom Ponet and other exiles were disenchanted, but all nobles who placed personal gain above the commonwealth. Ponet could not look back on the reign of a Protestant monarch as any sort of golden age except in the purity of the doctrine preached (and often ignored).

137. Ibid., Sig. G7.

138. Ibid., Sig. I5. Ponet was referring to Lord Paget.

139. Ibid., Sig. H3.

140. Skinner, Foundations, vol. II, p. 224, points out that most of these instances cited by Ponet were drawn from civil law and had been used by Melanchthon in his Prologemena. It is also pertinent to note that similar cases were cited by Melanchthon in his section of that work edited in 1554 by Ponet's colleague John Bale, A faythfull admonycion.

141. Ponet, Shorte Treatise, Sig. G8-G8v.

142. Though he approved of the killings of the idolatrous queens Athaliah and Jezebel, and made remarks on the frailty of women, Ponet did not seek to bar women from ruling. Cf. W. Stanford Reid, Trumpeters of God (New York: 1974), p. 145, and Little, "Origins of the Political Ideologies", p. 232.

143. Ponet, Shorte Treatise, Sig. H6v.

144. Ibid., Sig. H6. At the time that Ponet was writing, the Dudley conspiracy was being betrayed and the conspirators arrested.

145. Ibid., Sigs. H6v-H7.

146. Such was the burden of the "Exhortacion", Ibid., Sigs. K2-M4, where England was chastised for ignoring the Gospel and God's warnings.

147. Ibid., Sig. A5-A5v.

148. Ibid., Sigs. G2-G3 and L5.

149. Ibid., Sig. G3.

150. Ibid., Sigs. F7, Hv, H5, L2 and L3v.

151. Ibid., Sigs. E, Hv, H2v, H5, and H6v.

152. Ibid., Sig. D6.

153. Little, "Social Prophecy", p. 121.

154. Skinner, Foundations, vol. II, p. 210.

155. See above, Chapter II.

156. Ponet, Shorte Treatise, Sig. K3-K3v.

157. Skinner, Foundations, vol. II, p. 254.

158. Ponet, Shorte Treatise, Sig. L3.

159. Ibid., Sig. L. Ponet apeaks of "wise men and suche as loved their country...[who] thought it was most necessare to provyde for the savegarde of the hole by all meanes, and not for any particular parte", who fled into exile to plot their return and the overthrow of ruling tyrants. The comparison between Ponet's description of Thrasybolus and his men, and the workings of the Dudley conspiracy is interesting. Both were groups of exiles fleeing tyranny, aided by sympathetic foreigners, whose plan included the seizure of a strategic castle. These exiles Athenians are also graced with the term "poore banished men", a phrase which the English exiles

had used to describe themselves.

160. Dated 30 December 1556, The Lamentacion has yet to be ascribed to any author or publishing house, but its content is suggestive of an exile based in Strasbourg. Three editions of the tract survive. The first contained, in addition to the main body of the text, "A declaration of the reverent father in God Thomas Cranmer" of 1553, denying that the Archbishop had said mass on Mary's accession, and offering to defend the Edwardian Prayer Book and church practice. This is replaced in the two surviving 1558 versions by "an addycion off Callis". These 1558 editions are also without known authors or printers.

161. The Lamentacion, p. 3, cited verbatim from Latimer's famous "Sermon of the Plough" which set out the concerns of the commonwealth men. The sermon is reprinted in Corrie, ed., Sermons by Hugh Latimer.

162. The Lamentacion, pp. 5 and 13, complained of high taxes and dearth and of export policies harmful to Englishmen.

163. Ibid., pp. 9-10. The conclusion drawn from these cases is identical to that in Certayne Questions and the Shorte Treatise: "who wil trust such rulers with any maner promisses, when they thus seke to betray, the noble and gentillmen, of this realme. Is this the truth and credens that should be given to princes wordes, when they thus shamfully pluke bake that that they have grauntid, and perform not

that they have promisid." Other passages in The Lamentacion also show the debt of its author to earlier exile writers and the creation of a body of Marian Protestant myths. For example, like A Warnyng, the tract accuses the Marian regime of meaning to destroy the English nobility, and like Certayne Questions accuses the Queen of manipulating a pregnancy she knew to be false. Like Ponet's Shorte Treatise, the tract also attempts to rehabilition of Jane Grey and claims that Mary owed her life to the intervention of Cranmer against the wishes of Henry VIII and his Council.

164. The Lamentacion, p. 12. The tract claimed to have preferred the marriage of the Queen to Edward Courtenay, Earl of Devon, rather than the Spanish match. However, Courtenay, it was said, was "compelled for the save gard off his liff, to have traveled be nd the sees in to strange contres, wher as it supposid he was poisonid, for fear off putting the prince off Spain beside his protensid enterprise."
165. Ibid., p. 13.
166. Ibid., pp. 15-17.
167. Ibid., p. 11.
168. The Lamentacion and the Addicyon, p. 21.
169. Ibid., p. 23.
170. Ibid., pp. 23 and 21.
171. Admonition to Callays, stating its place of publication only as "From Exile", has been attributed to the de Zuttere press at Wesel, and was dated

12 April 1557. It is unpaginated.

172. Garrett, The Marian Exiles, p. 259. Pownoll, associated with the "hotter" sort of Protestant exile, had once lived in Calais. He had already written and translated other tracts during the exile.

173. Calais and its security had previously been discussed by Ponet's Shorte Treatise.

174. Admonition to Callays, p. "2".

175. Ibid., pp. "6" and "7". Pownoll was either more optimistic than his fellow exiles, or else carried away with his Old Testament analogy when he stated:

> The lorde then resarved some of the nobilitie in Israel, as Obadiah and other, who showed themselfes very favorable unto his servants, so hath god likewise reserved some of the nobilitie of thy mother England (althought thei be but few in nomber) as shildes to preserve his people from the tyranny of Antichrist...No thinge doubtinge but that thei shal finde favore with Obadia in the sight of Elias and Jehu, when as the lorde shal stire them up to overthrowe the Auters of Baal, and to distroie his idolatrous Prestes, with theire Princesse Jezabel.

176. Ibid., p. "13".

177. Ibid., p. "15".

178. Ibid., "3-5".

179. Ibid., pp. "10-11".

180. The tract is attributed to the de Zuttere press at Wesel where the Aarau colonists had recently stayed. For this work Traheron adopted the pseudonym "Benthalmai Outis", though his other works of 1558 bore his real name, indicating perhaps that the author felt there was more subversion in this tract than in his books on the Apocalypse or St. John's Gospel.

181. Traheron, A Warning to England To Repent, Sigs. A4-A4v.

182. Ibid., Sigs. B-Bv.

183. Ibid., Sigs. A2v and A5.

184. Ibid., Sigs. A2v-A3.

185. Garrett, The Marian Exiles, p. 162. Garrett's treatment of Goodman is full of factual error (e.g., his date of return to England, and his supposed authorship of John Knox's "Four Questions"), and dangerous speculation (Goodman's involvement in an assassination plot with Bartlett Greene and William Thomas). Much more valuable is Jane Dawson's "The Early Career of Christopher Goodman". A short account of Goodman's political thought is Dan G. Danner, "Christopher Goodman and the English Protestant Tradition of Civil Disobedience", Sixteenth Century Journal, vol. 8, no. 3, 1977, pp. 61-74.

186. Robinson, ed., Original Letters, vol. I, p. 347.

187. Arber, ed., Troubles at Frankfort, p. 86.

188. It was printed by Jean Crespin at Geneva and dated 1 January 1558. Dawson, "Christopher Goodman", p. 273, n. 1, mentions the possibility of a second edition printed later in the year.

189. Goodman, Superior Powers, p. 4. There may not have been unanimity amongst the English Genevans over Goodman's political thought. On his return to England, William Fuller told Queen Elizabeth that he and others of the colony had misliked Goodman's book when it was published. Dr. Williams Library, Morrice Collection, "C", f. 634.

190. Goodman, Superior Powers, p. 5. Whittingham here must have meant Calvin, for in a letter to Peter Martyr, after the book's publication, Goodman stated: "I requested the judgement of master Calvin...before the book was published, and I showed him the same propositions which I sent to you. And though he deemed them somewhat harsh, especially to those who are in the place of power, and that for this reason they should be handled with caution, yet he nevertheless admitted them to be true." Robinson, ed., Original Letters, vol. II, p. 771.

191. Goodman, Superior Powers, p. 30. It is a measure of the alienation of the Genevan colony from their exile colleagues that, in 1558 after almost four years of exile advocacy of resistance and works by Bale, Ponet and Peter Martyr, men in the mainstream of Protestantism, Goodman could make this claim. It may be that he thought previous tracts insufficiantly grounded in Scripture and overly concerned with secular oppression. It is very difficult to believe that Goodman had not read at least some of these works before he came to write his own.

192. Ibid., p. 50.

193. The only non-Biblical citations given by Goodman are a single reference to Aristotle on the importance of religion, one mention of Halle's chronicles and one of Gardiner's De Vera Obedentia. It also

seems probable that he had read Pole's Defence of the Unity of the Church, perhaps from the 1555 edition published at Strasbourg.

194. Goodman, Superior Powers, p. 213.

195. Ibid., pp. 54-55. Deuteronomy 17 contains much on kingship though Goodman also drew on other Mosaic books.

196. Ibid., p. 51.

197. Ibid., p. 52.

198. As we have seen, The Humble Supplication for the Restoring of Goddes Worde and Certayne Questions had previously attacked the idea of female rulers.

199. Goodman, Superior Powers, p. 54. Goodman had the courage of his convictions in this matter and stated that the Protestant hope, Princess Elizabeth, "that Godlie Lady and meke Lambe" was equally ineligible to succeed to the throne on account of her sex.

200. Ibid., pp. 53 and 97-8.

201. Ibid., p. 55.

202. Ibid., pp. 86-87.

203. Ibid., pp. 99 and 195.

204. Ibid., pp. 208-10 and 173. Goodman was especially contemptuous of those Englishmen, many of them Protestants and including former exiles, who consented to take part in the war against France. Chief among the sort of men whom Goodman labelled traitors and false gospellers was Francis Russell, Earl of Bedford, who had spent part of his exile in

Zurich but upon declaration of war joined the English forces in France. Garrett, The Marian Exiles, pp. 275-277.

205. Goodman, Superior Powers, pp. 70-72. The marginal note reads "Daniel was no Englishe courtier for he could not flatter".

206. Ibid., p. 77.

207. Ibid., pp. 85-88.

208. Ibid., p. 197. It appears that Goodman refers here to those exiles who had plotted against Mary in their French bases but who returned to English service in the war declared in 1557. Goodman termed them "carnall gospellers" who had "returned to their oldemaister Antichrist, to be his hired souldairs and to fight under his banner."

209. Ibid., p. 142.

210. The Cohabitacyon, f. 47v.

211. Calvin, The Institutes, vol. II, p. 1519 (Book IV, 20, 31).

212. Goodman, Superior Powers, pp. 34-36, 95, and 215.

213. Ibid., pp. 95 and 182. It is only partly a reflection of the exile perception of the behavior of the English Parliament under Mary that Goodman made no mention of that body as one with a duty to act against idolatry. His emphasis was on the individual Christian who must act in obedience to divine law, and not, as with many Continental Protestant theorists, on the institution vested with certain rights.

214. Ibid., p. 185. It is difficult to accept Quentin Skinner's analysis of Goodman's appeal to the people as stated in Foundations, vol. II, p. 210. Goodman, like Ponet, was not inspired by the vision of a Calvinist England under Edward. He claimed in Superior Powers (p. 42) that Edward was unable to achieve sufficient religious reform and had to endure the continuance of such superstitions as saints' days, "so great was the number of Papistes in the Perlament house". The Edwardian era, despite the purity of preaching, was, Goodman said (pp. 175-76), marked by conspiracy and rebellion, chiefly undertaken to defend the mass "and all the puddels of poperie with the Caterpillars and rable of all uncleane spirites". It was, in fact, the hypocrisy and irreligion of those years that caused God to plague England with Mary. Nor did Goodman have any confidence in the willingness of the people to rise up against the congregation of Satan (though Skinner is right in thinking this is what Goodman wished to inspire). Goodman knew the people to be turbulent when their physical possessions were threatened but, in the main, to be unconcerned with the defence of true religion, their "spiritual possession". Goodman's estimate of the state of religion in Marian England was not an optimistic one. The people he thought (pp. 198-99) were "the greatest parte of them perchance papists,

and will be maynteners of such ungodly proceadings as are now broghte in to England."

215. The differences between Ponet and the Genevan writers, Goodman and Knox, have been stressed by Michael Walzer in The Revolution of the Saints, and in "Revolutionary Ideology: The Case of the Marian Exiles". Walzer contrasts the resistance theory of Ponet at "Anglican" Strasbourg with that of those alienated saints in Calvin's Geneva, Knox and Goodman. The former saw tyranny as theft, while the latter, revolutionary prophets, identified tyranny with idolatry. P.M. Little "The Revolutionary Ideology of John Knox" has shown, however, that the Marian exiles all shared a prophetic stance. Quentin Skinner, Foundations, vol. II, has demonstrated that "Calvinist" resistance theory was not a product of Calvin's Geneva, and has also sought to reduce the importance of any differences between Goodman and Ponet. Nevertheless, despite these criticisms of Walzer, he was correct in perceiving that Ponet's view of tyranny and the foundations of its remedy were fundamentally different from those of the Genevans. As we have seen Ponet (and several other exile writers) believed that resistance might legitimately be triggered by secular oppression, as well as religious, while Goodman condemned those who rose up in defence of their earthly rights or goods. Superior Powers, pp. 176-77, and 197.

Interestingly, there are certain passages in Superior Powers which are reminiscent of the Shorte Treatise and suggest that Goodman may have read Ponet's book. Compare, for example, Goodman on the advantages of knowing the limits of obedience (p. 105) with Ponet on the same subject (Sig. Cv); Goodman on the folly of following man's reason in the face of divine omnipotence (p. 192), with Ponet (Sig. B4v); or Superior Powers on non-Christians judging Christians (p. 92) with the Shorte Treatise (Sig. C7). Goodman and Ponet also agree that God was not to be viewed as the author of tyranny, that evil custom was to be abolished, that rulers with absolutist pretensions sought to treat their subjects as bond-slaves, that Mattathias Maccabee was not to be considered an inferior magistrate, and that Romans 13 referred to the office and not the office holder. It seems certain (despite Danner, "Christopher Goodman", p. 71) that Goodman and Ponet were acquainted in Strasbourg in 1554-55 and that Goodman would have read his erstwhile colleague's book.

216. Superior Powers, p. 165.

217. Ibid., p. 181.

218. Ibid., pp. 182-84. Compare Goodman's remark here, that the suppression of idolatry was the reason for which men were made rulers, with Ponet's view that it was the maintenance of justice which was the reason for civil government.

219. Ibid., pp. 187-88. "For then are they no more publik persons, contemning their publik auctoritie in usinge it agaynst the Lawes, but are to be taken of all men, as private persones, and so examyned and punished." This is not necessarily the same as Ponet's insistence that the prince be subject to his own positive laws, for Goodman here is referring to God's law.

220. Ibid., pp. 200-1.

221. Ibid., pp. 202-10.

222. Ibid., p. 204. Goodman's only slight criticism of Wyatt, though, was that his stated intentions had stressed the patriotic element at the expense of the religious "which allwayes ought to be preferred.". Ibid., p. 211.

223. Ibid., pp. 225-26. Goodman condemned those Englishmen who spent their exile in France or Italy, ignoring the Swiss and German colonies who might either have comforted them or been comforted by them.

224. Ibid., unpaginated, verse 7. It is interesting that Kethe's description of tyranny does not seek to conform itself with Goodman's. There is no reference to idolatry or other violations of Scriptural dictates on kingship; rather, there is the view that a bad ruler disregards law and duty to further his own will. There is no explicit suggestion that Mary is a usurper because of her sex, though Kethe refers to her in verse 10 as "A brut beast untamed, a misbegot then,/ More

meete to be ruled, then raigne over men."

225. Ibid., verses 11-17. Kethe gives indication of having read other resistance tracts. Like Bradford and Ponet, he cited the example of Naples under Spanish rule, and warned that Spaniards would not reward the English traitors who had helped them. Echoing a passage in the Shorte Treatise, Kethe prophecied that "this then doth remayne/ When Spaniards are placed, ye muste to newe Spayne".

226. John Knox, John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland, ed. William Croft Dickinson (London: 1949), vol. I, p. 78.

227. Jasper Ridley, John Knox (Oxford: 1968), p. 85.

228. Ibid., p. 110, citing Knox's "Epistle to the Congregation of Berwick".

229. The work was published twice in 1554, by different printers and with different titles. See Chapter II for these publication details. It was reprinted in The Works of John Knox, vol. III, pp. 161-216 under the running title A Godly Letter to the Faithful in London, and all citations here refer to that version.

230. Ibid., pp. 190-191.

231. Ibid., p. 194. Knox does not refer here to the inferior magistrate theory of resistance, but rather means that the civil authority is responsible for the maintenance of true religion.

232. Robinson, ed., Original Letters, vol. II, pp. 744-47.

233. Rose-Troup, The Western Rebellion of 1549, pp. 215-16.

234. Robinson, ed., Original Letters, vol. II, pp. 745.

235. The example of these rebellious Armenians was cited in 1554 by the Melanchthon preface to Bale's Faythfull admonycion.

236. Robinson, ed., Original Letters, vol. II, p. 746. This statement by Bullinger goes beyond his approval of inspired tyrannicide found in his Decades and may be his boldest statement on resistance. Calvin's replies are outlined in a letter to Bullinger and are virtually the same as the Zurich reformer's. Calvin himself noted that "there was not the least discrepancy between our ideas." Jules Bonnet, ed., Letters of John Calvin, vol. III (Philadelphia: 1858), tr. Marus Robert Gilchrist, pp. 37-38.

237. Knox, Works, vol. III, p. 236.

238. Ibid., p. 235. However, Richard L. Greaves, "John Knox, the Reformed Tradition, and the Development of Resistance Theory", Journal of Modern History, On-Demand Supplement (abstracted vol. 48, no. 3, Sept. 1976), pp. 6 and 32, argues that Knox was not deterred by the answers received during his Swiss trip.

239. John Knox, A Faythfull admonition, Sigs. E3-E4.

240. Ibid., Sig. F8v. It is difficult to see in this tract the radical change in Knox's thinking that W. Stanford Reid detects, or to believe, as does Reid, that it represents "a turning point in his religio-political views"; Trumpeter of God, pp. 113-

114. The only significant difference between this and previous works was Knox's references to secular complaints against Mary. These, however, were not to prove major factors in Knox's later thoughts on resistance and he was still years away from advocating any violent withstanding of the Queen by the people.

241. Knox, Works, vol. IV, pp. 225-36. The letter was undated but Laing places it among Knox's letters of 1556.

242. Ibid., p. 228.

243. Ibid., p. 257. The letter was signed by Glencairn, Lorne, Erskine of Dun and James Stewart.

244. Ibid., pp. 284-85.

245. This covenant was signed by the Earl of Argyll and his son, Glencairn, Morton, and Erskine of Dun. Knox, History of the Reformation, vol. I, pp. 136-37.

246. Knox, The First Blast, f. 48.

247. Calvin, when defending his city from any suggestion that Genevan Protestantism might agree with Knox's attack on gynocracy, told Cecil that he had privately discussed women's rule with the Scot. He had agreed that it was a deviation from nature but that God had occasionally sent extraordinary women into positions of power. Moreover national custom in many realms sanctioned female rule and that an attack on it would be unwise. Hastings Robinson, ed., Zurich Letters, second series (Cambridge: 1845),

pp. 34-35. Goodman's inclusion of an attack on government by women in his Superior Powers of January 1558 must be taken to be more than coincidence, and to be the product of exchanges on the subject with Knox. However, against this view should be set Knox's statement to Cecil that he had discussed the ideas in The First Blast with none of his exile colleagues at Geneva before the book's publication. Knox, Works, vol. VI, p. 18.

248. Knox, The First Blast, f.2.

249. Knox's neglect of English exile works such as Certayne Questions and Becon's Humble Supplication which had castigated women's rule, Ponet's Shorte Treatise which had dealt with popular power over the magistrate, and the numerous tracts that had pointed out Mary's bastardy or treachery, is all the more interesting in the light of his extensive knowledge of Continental Protestant resistance theory. More than any other Marian exile Knox gives evidence of having carefully studied the thinking of Europeans on this point, clearly reflecting his years of uncertainty about the justification of resistance. Aside from embarking on his Swiss trip of early 1554, Knox read widely. His Answer to...an Anabaptist (Geneva: 1560) shows that he had read both Sleidan, with his history of German Protestant resistance, and Beza's De Haereticis. Knox's 1564 debate with Maitland of Lethington, recorded in his History, indicates that he had read the Magdeburg Bekenntnis and was familiar

enough with the resistance writings of Luther, Melanchthon, Bucer, Musculus and Calvin to be able to counter his opponent's claims about them.

250. Knox, The First Blast, ff. 3v-4.

251. Ibid., ff. 10-12v. A marginal note on f. 12v referring to the history of Romilda who betrayed her city out of lust, is the only indication that Knox may have read Ponet's Shorte Treatise, which went into that story in some detail. The suggestion however is made by P.M. Little, "John Knox and English Social Prophecy", p. 126, that it was Ponet's use of the concept of natural law which prompted Knox to use it in The First Blast to attack women's government.

252. Knox, The First Blast, ff. 17v-25v.

253. Ibid., f. 17v.

254. Ibid., ff. 14v-17v. Knox stated that he did not depend on the judgements of men and thought his arguments strong, provided "that God by his will reveled, and manifest worde, stand plain and evident" on his side. Ibid., f. 26v.

255. Ibid., ff. 30 and 32v.

256. Ibid., f. 33v. Knox explained that he would go into more detail on this point in his proposed Second Blast.

257. Ibid., f. 37. The overwhelmingly Scriptural foundation of Knox's attack on women's rule, despite his reference to patristic or classical sources, can be seen when he concludes that supporters of

the authority of women will be compelled to admit that they have been acting against God and that female authority is usurpation because "it repugneth to the will of God expressed in his sacred Worde." Ibid., f. 37g.

258. Ibid., ff. 49v-50.

259. Ibid., f. 50v.

260. Ibid., ff. 52v-53.

261. Ibid., f. 53v. Knox promised to deal with this resistance and the implications of breaking one's oath of obedience in The Second Blast.

262. Ibid., f. 56.

263. The Appellation was printed by the same house which had produced The First Blast, Poullain and Rebul, and was dated July 1558.

264. Ridley, John Knox, p. 241.

265. Knox, The Appellation, f. 14.

266. In his attempt to prove that the civil authority was responsible for religious reform, Knox appears to quote Isaiah 49:23 - "Kinges should be norishers to the Church of God, that they should abase their heades, and lovingly embrace the children of God." Ibid., f. 25. It is interesting to note that this is a crude paraphrase which omits, seemingly for the sake of Knox'e view of female rulers, the prophet's words that queens would be nursing mothers to the Church. Significantly, Calvin claimed that he had drawn Knox's attention to this passage in their 1557 discussion. Robinson, ed.,

Zurich Letters, second series, pp. 34-35.

267. Knox, The Appellation, f. 26.

268. Ibid., f. 35. The background to Knox's use of the covenant is discussed in Richard L Greaves, "John Knox and the Covenant Tradition", Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 24, 1973, pp. 23-32. Greaves notes possible theological and political sources for Knox's concept including the writings of Tyndale and the practice of "banding" in Scottish history. Greaves believes (p. 27) that The Appellation outlines two different covenants -- one between God and the King or magistrates, and the other between the sovereign and his subject. In fact, one only type of covenant is conceived of by Knox in this work, a band between God and the whole people including ruler and magistrates, the chief consequence of which was to be the destruction of idolatry.

269. Knox, The Appellation, f. 36. Knox's distinction between the two sorts of situations and the differences in the type of resistance required was an important one to him. Twice on his return to Scotland he defended the duty of violent resistance, in opposition to those who could only justify passive disobedience. To Mary Queen of Scots he explained that the Apostles, Daniel and the Hebrew Children had not used the sword because God had not given them the power or the means, but that violence was justifiable in other circumstances.

Knox, History, vol. II, pp. 16-17. To Maitland of Lethington he maintained that passivity in the face of persecution by tyrants or infidels pertained only to weak and dispersed Christians. Knox's advocacy of resistance, however, was said to apply to those circumstances where the people were "assembled together in one body of a Common-wealth, unto whom God has given sufficient force, not only to resist, but also to suppress all kind of open idolatry." Ibid., pp. 121-22. To Knox the power to resist seemed to necessitate the duty. This may help to explain why, after years of indecision on this topic, Knox chose to urge action in 1557-58, responding to events in Scotland and the growing strength of the Protestant party.

270. Knox, The Appellation, f. 46v.

271. Ibid., f. 51. Knox is at his most eloquent and touching when expounding on this point.

272. Ibid., f. 55v.

273. Ibid., f. 77v. Besides the opposition that his first book had engendered among supporters of the Catholic queens, English and Continental Protestants were outraged by Knox's attack on gynocracy. Sir Anthony Cooke, one of the leading laymen of the Strasbourg congregation, wrote to Geneva to protest, as did John Foxe from Basle . Francis Hotman and Calvin himself opposed themselves to Knox's ideas and the book was banned from sale in Geneva. Ridley, John Knox, p. 281.

274. This was Knox's first admission that he had written the anonymous First Blast. The Second Blast was never published though Knox, in a letter to Anne Locke in April 1559, threatened that it would sound "somewhat more sharp, except men be more moderat then I hear they are." Knox, Works, vol. VI, p. 14.

275. Knox, The Appellation, ff. 77-78.

276. Ibid., ff. 59v-77.

277. Ibid., ff. 59v, 60v, and 75v. Gilby's counsel (f. 74) of not trusting to arms is not a condemnation of resistance but a warning that trust in the sword and the strength of man would come to naught unless repentance and prayer was undertaken.

278. The work was published at Geneva by Poullain and Rebul, probably shortly before The Appellation of July 1558.

279. Knox, Letter to the Regent, 1558, f. 12.

280. Ibid., ff. 15v-16.

281. Robinson, ed., Original Letters, vol. II, pp. 768-69; a letter of 20 August, 1558.

282. Knox, Works, vol. VI, p. 5; 18 May, 1558.

283. Ridley, Knox, p. 284, claims that as Elizabeth was known to have attended mass the Genevans regarded her as an idolatress. However, Goodman referred to her as "that Godlie Lady and meke Lambe", Superior Powers, p. 54, and Knox was to maintain that The First Blast was not written against Elizabeth, for whose reign he had long thirsted. Knox, Works,

vol. VI, p. 48.

284. See Chapter I for an outline of Bucer and Zwingli's contributions. Bucer's commentary on the Book of Judges in which he advocated an elective monarchy had been published in Geneva, 1554.

CHAPTER IV: ELIZABETHAN PROTESTANTS AND RESISTANCE WRITINGS

The reaction in Protestant circles in England and on the Continent to the 1558 writings of Knox and Goodman was mostly negative. Fellow exiles such as William Fuller, John Foxe, and Sir Anthony Cooke registered their disapproval.[1] In Geneva, sale of Knox's First Blast was banned and other of his books scrutinized; letters from French reformers reached Calvin agreeing with his opposition to these new doctrines.[2] In England, the distaste of Elizabeth's government for the works caused Knox to be barred from entering England, blighted Goodman's career, and soured relations between the new Queen and Geneva.[3] Matthew Parker, among other divines, spoke openly against the books and in a letter to Nicholas Bacon in March 1559 expressed his horror at the consequences:

> If such principles be spread into men's heads, as now they be framed and referred to the judgement of the subject, of the tenant, and of the servant, to discuss what is tyranny, and to discern whether his prince, his landlord, his master, is a tyrant, by his own fancy and collection supposed, what lord of the council shall ride quietly minded in the streets, among desperate beasts? what master shall be sure in his bedchamber. [4]

The great fear of most of the returned exiles[5] seems to have been that the Queen and public opinion might associate Protestantism with sedition at a time when the religious settlement in England was still uncertain. This fear is reflected in a number of

writings of 1559, some of which, however, show that aspects of exile resistance had been accepted.

In April of that year former exile Edwin Sandys wrote to Matthew Parker that English papists had forced the returnees to produce a statement of doctrine.[6] This declaration, based in part upon the Edwardian Forty-Two Articles, made certain remarks on political obligation which clearly reflected a desire to repudiate some points of exile resistance theory. Noting that they had been branded "sowers of sedition and teachers of disobedience" these Protestants affirmed their belief in the importance of the role of the civil magistrate and defended the right of women to bear rule:

> The word of God doth not condemn the government or regiment of a woman, but that such women as by succession, inheritance or other just title according to the orders and policies of the realm are placed in such estate, are lawful magistrates, and are no less in any respect to be obeyed and honoured in all lawful things than if they were men, kings, princes...[7]

The declaration went on to condemn the doctrine of tyrannicide:

> A tyrant, or evil magistrate, which by succession or election attaineth to any princely estate or government, is a power ordained of God, and is also to be honoured and obeyed of the people in all things not contrary to God, as their magistrate and governor. It is not lawful for any private person or persons to kill or by any means to procure the death of a tyrant or evil person being the ordinary magistrate. All conspiracies, seditions, and rebellions of private men against the magistrates, men or women, good governors or evil, are unlawfull and against the will and word of God.[8]

It is interesting to note how far from being a doctrine of unconditional obedience the declaration

is, and to see, by the absence of certain things from this condemnation, how far the main body of Protestant thought on the subject had moved. While the articles are very explicit in defending women's rule and the rights of legitimate kings, it is equally clear that they enjoin no obedience to unlawful acts or commands against the will of God, nor do they condemn the resistance of the inferior magistracy, or attacks on a tyrant by usurpation. The advocates of much of the exile resistance theory might well have thought that these criticisms had left their doctrine untouched.[9]

Writings from Geneva

Another repudiation of Knox and Goodman which conceded even more to the exile resistance theorists was Laurence Humphrey's 1559 work De Religionis conservatione et reformatione vera.[10] Though most of the work concerns the necessity of further Church reform, Humphrey also takes certain exile authors to task for their political writings. He chides those whose zeal would lead to holy war and to the condemnation of a ruler before her policies have been set out.[11] He defends the role of women and denies that private citizens have any right to violently attack their ruler. However Humphrey does not believe that tyranny should go unchecked. He praises the communal wisdom of representative bodies whose job is to restrain the rashness of the people and the passions of

the King. If a tyrant refuses to summon this body they can assemble themselves and, as the whole is greater than one part, they can depose that ruler who had proved unable to do his duty or who had betrayed his people.[12] As well as defending the rights of the inferior magistrate Humphrey also mentioned another figure capable of justified violent resistance: the assassin inspired by God. Men such as Ehud, the murderer of King Eglon, and Jehu, who killed Ahab and the rest of the royal family, Humphrey distinguished from ordinary citizens, "privati", as being men moved by the spirit of God to kill idolaters and illegitimate kings.[13] Particularly pertinent was the revolt of the Maccabees which seemed to combine divine inspiration and inferior magistracy in a commendable struggle against those who sought to destroy the true religion.[14]

In 1559 Humphrey wrote another Latin work which defended the right of the inferior magistracy to resist tyranny.[15] The Nobles castigated the Marian ruling class for cooperating with the campaign of persecution against Protestants and maintained that the nobility had a responsibility to ensure the eradication of idolatry and superstition.[16] He condemned too the rebellious commons who attempted to bring about reform by violence but excepted from this condemnation those men in public office or inspired by God. To those acting in a public capacity, with the consent of all degrees, did the responsibility

belong to maintain justice and law and to bridle tyranny.[17]

Despite the criticism his works had received while Mary was still alive, and the attitude of Laurence Humphrey and other exiles[18] after Elizabeth's accession, John Knox does not seem to have been moved from his opinions. Though he was willing to accept the legitimacy of the new Queen, Knox demanded that she openly confess that her rule rested, not on succession or the laws of the realm, but on an extra-ordinary calling from God, waiving, as it were, the usual divine condemnation of female government.[19] Moreover, he continued to publish his views on resistance which had been shaped by the experience of life under a raging tyrant and to claim that they were no less valid under a new monarch. These views appeared in a two-part work, The Copie of An Epistle, which combined a pamphlet written in the last days of Mary's reign with one penned after the news of the Queen's death had reached Geneva.[20] The first part of the tract was a letter to his old parishioners in the north of England decrying the state of religion and urging them to remove the iniquity from amongst them. This repentance was to be an active and violent one as he urged them to base their behaviour on that model set out in his Appellation with its letters to the Scottish nobles and people calling for resistance.[21] It might be thought that Knox, on hearing of the new English ruler, might set aside a work

containing such inflammatory advice. Instead Knox augmented it with the appended "Exhortation to England" written in January 1559. With it Knox hoped to engender opposition to any form of English church settlement which fell short of his very demanding requirements. He reminded Englishmen of the covenant that the Jews had made with God to keep the true religion, how they had slid back into idolatry, and how this covenant had been renewed and pure worship restored. The consequences of this part were ominous:

> by renuing of which covenant unhappie and cruel Athalia was killed, the people dyd enter in the house of Baal, brake it downe with his altars and images, even to powder, and finally before the altars of Baal dyd most justly kyl Mathan Baals great preste. 22

Such a massacre, said Knox, should have been the duty of Englishmen "in the dayes of that most execrable Idolatres Marie", and the failure of the country to wipe out impiety in the beginning had made everyone guilty of the persecution which followed. Such a lapse must not happen again and all must ensure that it is only the true religion that is established under Queen Elizabeth. Popish dregs were to be cleaned away and the work of God was to take precedence over the wishes of politicians in the religious settlement: "No prince nor parliament ought to do anie things in matters of religion without the assurance of Gods worde."[23] That resistance which he had urged under Mary was to be repeated under Elizabeth if the true religion was not established. Any prince who attempted to institute an idolatrous worship was unworthy to

rule and was to "be adjudged to death according to Gods commaundements" in Deuteronomy 13.[24] England should at once imitate the Jews under King Asa and renew their covenant with God and set up the true practice of religion. Such a covenant would bind all to seek God, with those refusing this search to be killed, no matter their sex or their religion. Said Knox, "This is thy duetie and this the onely remedy (o England) to stay Gods vengeance."[25] It is little wonder that Knox was in such bad odour with the English government or that the ideas of returning exiles were treated with such suspicion.

While Knox, Goodman and most of the exiles were returning to England, others lingered in Geneva to complete the task, set in 1556, of producing a new body of ecclesiastical literature for the English church. A catechism, book of prayer, psalter, and New Testament translation had been completed, but it remained for men such as William Whittingham, William Cole, John Baron, Anthony Gilby, and Rowland Hall to produce that colony's most enduring monument, the Geneva Bible.[26] This translation, so remarkable and influential, was completed in the spring of 1560 and dedicated to Queen Elizabeth in the hopes that she would effect a throughgoing reformation of the English Church.

The Geneva Bible presented several novel and attractive features to its readers. It was the first English Bible to be printed in Roman type, the first

to be divided into verses for ease of memorization and reference, and its quarto-size was very convenient for home reading. The most striking feature of this Bible however was its marginalia, termed on the title page as "moste profitable annotations upon all the hard places". Amounting to some 300,000 words, about one-third of the text,[27] the notes consist, in part, of the cross-references, alternate translations, and short explanations that were common in English Bibles of the time, but more interesting are the thousands of longer notes, argumentative, exhortatory, didactic, and doctrinal, which contain a body of opinion on things religious, social and political. These notes, in a Bible that appeared in 120 editions before 1611,[28] were probably the most pervasive vehicle for the spread of ideas on resistance in Elizabethan England.

Those notes in the Geneva Bible which touch on political topics naturally reflect the mentality of authors shaped by oppression and persecution. They continually castigate the tyrants of this earth and oppose the claims of absolutist kings.[29] They claim that God will punish wicked rulers in this world as well as the next,[30] but, more importantly, they see a role for human agency in resisting tyranny.

Like the notes to the Genevan New Testament translation of 1557 by William Whittingham, the marginalia of the 1560 New Testament take a passive

view of resistance. They state that men should not obey the orders of their superiors when "they commande, or forbid us in any thing contrary to the worde of God"[31] but they seem to discourage any violence when they note: "The exercising of the sworde is forbide to private persones."[32] Therefore it is to the Old Testament with its histories of tyrants, usurpers, assassins, and depositions that one turns for approving notes on violent resistance.

One of the principal ways in which the Geneva Bible commends resistance is in its marginalia accompanying the stories of divinely sanctioned killers. When the young Moses slays an Egyptian who was oppressing the Jews, Exodus 2:12, the note explains that he did so "being assured that God had appointed him to deliver the Israelites". It is important to note that this assurance did not derive from any public commission from God who, as yet, had not openly spoken to Moses, but from an inward conviction. When the Biblical text seems to contradict this concept of tyrannicide, in I Samuel 26:9 where David refrains from killing Saul with the words: "Destroye him not: for who can lay his hand on the Lords anointed, and be giltles?", the note explains: "To wit, in his owne private cause: for Jehu slew two Kings at Gods appointment." Jehu's killing of Queen Jezabel reinforced this lesson in II Kings 9:33 where the marginal comment reads: "This he did by the mocion of the Spirit of God, that her blood shulde be shed, that

had shed the blood of innocents, to be a spectacle of Gods judgements to all tyrants." Those men and women in the Book of Judges who slew tyrants in defence of Israel are noted by the introductory Argument to that book to be so chosen not by succession, nor by the people, "but raised up, as it semed best to God".

This figure of the divine tyrannicide had appealed to Ponet but had not figured greatly in the works of Knox or Goodman, Their concern was the responsibility of the people and their leaders to eradicate idolatry, by violence if necessary. This concern is greatly in evidence in the Geneva Bible's notes. The fundamental passage in this war on idol worship is taken from Deuteronomy 13 where Moses decrees that all who consent to idolatry are to be killed, even if they be family or loved ones.[33] This is the justification for Jehu's murder of the priests of Baal in II Kings 10:23 and the note: "Thus God wolde have his servants preserved, and idolaters destroyed: as in his lawe he giveth expresse commandement, Deuteronomy 13." The unfortunate priests of Baal had also been the victims of an earlier execution order given by Elijah (significantly, a private citizen calling on the common people) in I Kings 18:40. The comment of the translators of the Geneva Bible is: "He commanded them that as they were truely persuaded to confesse the onely God: so thei wolde serve him with all their power and destroye the idolaters his enemies."

Knox and Goodman, in their resistance writings, linked the destruction of idolatry and the idea of a covenant. This linkage is emphasized by the notes in the Geneva Bible as they comment on the overthrow of two Queens by a people and king bound together to eradicate false religion. King Asa of Judah and his subjects, in obedience to the dictates of Deuteronomy 13, swore an oath "which commanded all idolaters to be put to death according to the Law of God". In consequence of that oath Asa deposed his mother (or grandmother) Queen Maacah for her worship of idols. When this episode first appears, in I Kings 15:13, the commentators approvingly note: "Nether kindred nor autoritie ought to be regarded when they blaspheme God and become idolaters, but must be punished." However when II Chronicles 15:16 retells the tale, half-hearted Asa is castigated because "herein he shewed that he lacked zeale: for she ought to have dyed bothe by the covenant, and by the Lawe of God: but he gave place to foolish pitie, and wolde also seme after a sorte to satisfie the Lawe." The covenant is again invoked when the people, led by Jehoiada the priest, rise up against the usurping Queen Athaliah. Athaliah is assassinated, in II Chronicles 23, despite her cries of "Treason!", the marginal note to verse 13 commenting: "Declaring her vile impudencie, which having unjustely, and by murther usurped the crowne, wold still have defeated the true possessor, and therefore called true obedience, treason." Having

killed the usurper, the priests Jehoiada then joined himself, the people and the new child-king in a covenant. The people then destroyed the temple of Baal and killed all his priests, as, the note to verse 17 says, "The Lord commanded in his Lawe bothe for the persone and also the citie".

The role of the common people in these acts of murder and iconoclasm are quite evident and the notes reinforce this popular responsibility when commenting on the story in Joshua 22 of the tribes of Israel who built an altar, thought by other tribes to be an idolatrous one. These offended tribes gathered in arms to destroy these religious rebels, for, as the note to verse 19 claims, to "rise anie other service then God hath appointed, is to rebel against God". What is important to note is that the assembly, which is said, verse 16, to have spoken with one voice, consisted not only "of the princes, but also of the commune people".

The approval of resistance to a wicked king is buttressed by two notes on the treatment meted out to King Jehoram. The first occurs in the story of the rebellion of the city of Libnah which, the marginal comment on II Kings 8:22 claims, was "a citie in Judah given to the Levites, Joshua 21, 13, and after turned from Jehoram because of his idolatrie". Of Jehoram we read in the note to II Chronicles 21:20 that he "was not regarded, but deposed for his wickednes and idolatrie."

Though Knox and Goodman would have approved of these statements on resistance as set out in the marginalia of the Geneva Bible, on two important points the commentators actually contradict the views of those exile writers. The first, not surprisingly in a work dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, is on the topic of women's rule. Though the Bible notates many of the passages that Knox and Goodman drew on for their condemnation of government by females as unnatural and disastrous, nowhere is there the suggestion that a Queen is a usurper on account of her sex.[34] The marginalia occasionally stress the divine calling of females such as Jael or Deborah but, unlike in Knox's thought, there is no call for a Queen to admit the exceptional, God-given nature of her rule. The second fundamental disagreement occurs over the use made by Goodman of the instructions on kingship, found chiefly in Deuteronomy 17, to conclude that regal legitimacy stemmed directly from adherence to Biblical precepts in the election of a king. and in royal government according to Christian rules. The notes call for no such overthrow of existing social orders for, as the comment on Romans 13:5 states, "no private man can contemne that government which God hathe appointed without the breache of his conscience"; nor does the ruler necessarily have to be a Christian, according to the note on Titus 3:1: "Althogh the rulers be infideles, yet we are bounde to obey them in civil polices, and where thei commande us nothing

against the worde of God." It seems clear that, while not retreating on two basic justifications for resistance, divine inspiration to tyrannicide and the responsibility for the faithful to eradicate idolatry, those responsible for the Geneva Bible have backed away from two of their colleagues' more radical points. These men were willing to preach the virtues of resistance in the reign of a Protestant sovereign but were loath to challenge the grounds of her legitimacy.

Though the Geneva Bible proved immensely popular throughout the reign of Elizabeth the notes[35] aroused much opposition in high places. Archbishop Parker, in the production of the official Bishops' Bible, decreed that the translators were "to make no bitter notes uppon any text, or yet to set downe any determinacion in places of controversie." King James complained in his day about the resistance content of some notes which he claimed were "very partiall, untrue, seditious, and savouring too much of daungerous, and trayterous conceites."[36] Despite this opposition the marginalia of the Geneva Bible had its triumphs. The notes that accompanied the Bishops' Bible included many drawn directly from the Genevan version,[37] and among this number are some approving of resistance. David's refusal to kill Saul which, if left on its own, might tend to condemn tyrannicide is noted by: "To wit, in his owne private cause: for otherwyse Jehu slue two kings at gods appointment." Asa's deposition of Queen Maacah drew the comment that

idolators "are to be punished without respect of person" and his sparing of her life prompts the remark that "herein he showed that he lacked zeale: for she ought to have dyed both by the covenaunt and lawe of God."[38] King James' prejudice against seditious notes seems to have borne no fruit either, for numerous editions of his Authoized Version were published with the Genevan notes as accompaniment, carrying the message of the Marian exiles up to the days of the Civil War.

A Return to Passivity

These resistance writings of the early Elizabethan period were the last by Englishmen for some time. The Protestants who battled for still further church reform and who were handed a series of disappointing set-backs by the government in the 1560's and 1570's chose a path of passive disobedience. These Puritans, throughout their arguments during the Vestiarian Controversy, the purges of the clergy and the furor over the Admonitions to Parliament,[39] refrained from advocating violent resistance. Robert Crowley, the Edwardian "Commonwealth Man" and Marian exile, maintained that while superstition and idolatry ought to be banished from the realm "they that are privat men ought to refrayne frome force, seing the sword and power of constray ming (sic) is not committed to them."[40] Nevertheless he pointed out that obedience to rulers was not unconditional and that subjects

were often required to be the judge of their princes' commands.

> We wyll give as large lymites of obeydience, as the scripture giveth...Wee graunt that often times the subject ought to obey when the Prince dothe evill to commaund: but this stretchith no farther than temporall matters...Yow thynke it daungerous for subjectes to restraine the Princes authorities, to boundes and lymites. We thinke it as dangerous, to enlarge the Princes authoritie beyond the bondes and lymites of holy scripture. 41

(Crowley himself was not above a little physical resistance to ungodly commands. He forcibly barred singers clad in surplices from his church during a 1566 funeral.) Anthony Gilby, who had supported Knox's theories during the exile, said:

> they talke of obedience and concorde, but ther is no obedience against the Lorde, no nor concorde to be desired, but wher gods glory and verite is preserved, Else better to have al the worlde in hurly burlies, and heaven and earth to shake, than one joyte of gods glory shulde decaie.[42]

Gilby likened those who could compel all ministers to wear popish vestments to the persecuting Marian bishops but did not advocate the same violent remedy for the Elizabethan episcopacy.

What makes this rejection of previous resistance theory all the more striking is that, in several instances, these Puritan writers chose to defend their non-violent disobedience with reference to books defending armed resistance.[43] In the case of the authors of A Seconde admonition to the Parliament, they flatly contradicted the rights of the inferior magistracy.[44]

One of the reasons why the nonconforming Protestants chose to express their disobedience in such a

fashion was the campaign launched by exiled English Catholics to link Protestants, and particularly Calvinists, with sedition. Thomas Dorman noted how the English Protestant exiles had denied that a woman might lawfully rule and now maintained that one might hold sway in spiritual as well as temporal matters.[45] He claimed that it was now the Protestant boast that they could make kings and depose them at their will.[46] Thomas Stapleton mentioned the seditious writings of Knox, Gilby, and Goodman; noted that two Elizabethan bishops, Edwin Sandys and Robert Horne, had once pronounced their Queen a bastard; and that all Reformers since the time of the Lollards have been disloyal and rebellious.[47] The most sensational of these Catholic exile attacks came from the printer John Fowler who translated and augmented a Latin tract attacking the sedition and atrocities of Protestants.[48] This Oration accused Luther of being begotten of an incubus, Calvin of debauchery with a nun, and English Protestants of murderous designs on Queen Mary.[49] Worst of the English was Goodman, named as the author of "a monstruous Booke in deede...againste the monstrouse Rayne of Women", who tried to stir the people to rebellion. This seditious behaviour was the unalterable practice of Protestants who "by foraine battayle abrode, or by rebellion at home...trouble and disquiete the peaceable state and good order of all common weales."[50]

The arrival of Mary Queen of Scots, the Rising

in the North, and the publication of the papal bull "Regnans In Excelsis" which declared Elizabeth excommunicated and deposed[51] meant that the English government became even more anxious to deny any arguments for the justifiability of resistance. A new homily on obedience was set forth and, with an eye to certain Marian exile claims, maintained that all rulers, men and women, were ordained by God.[52] Archbishop Parker was particularly interested in neutralizing any threat that might have come from Christopher Goodman, now returned to England after a lengthy involvement with the Scottish Reformation. In 1571 Goodman was harried by church officials who sought a retraction of the political ideas expounded in exile, and a subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Book of Common Prayer, and the surplice.[53] That year Goodman acknowledged Queen Elizabeth as rightful sovereign both by God's appointment and lawful descent, and swore never again to repeat those doctrines of resistance which had been conceived during a time of extreme persecution and which he now wished he had not written.[54] Parker's letter to Edmund Grindal, Archbishop of York, instructing him to secure the subscription of the former Genevans, Lever, Whittingham and Gilby, written months after Goodman's first retraction at Lambeth, seems still to have expressed concern over the ideas expressed in Superior Powers for Grindal replied:

> I would gladly see Mr. Goodman's book. I never saw it but once, beyond seas; and then I thought, where

> I read it, that his arguments were never concludent, but always I found more in the conclusion than in the premises. These articles that your grace hath gathered out of it are very dangerous, and tend to sedition. 55

Parker's anxiety over the power of Goodman's theories cannot have been assuaged by two assassination attempts in 1573 with Puritan overtones. The first attempt was made by Peter Birchet in October 1573 on John Hawkings in the belief that the victim was Christopher Hatton. Birchet's statement on tyrannicide, made under questioning while in prison, shows how he represented the figure of the divinely-inspired assassin, as viewed by exile theorists such as John Ponet. When asked whether a private man persuaded in conscience that someone were a Papist and hindered God's glory, might, of his own authority, kill him, and whether this were warranted by Scripture, Birchet replied:

> in my simple judgement, being no Divine, a private man being persuaded in his own conceit, by such presumptions and proofs as I have had of Hatton, that [such] one as he (as I have thought) is a willful Papist, and hindereth the glory of God so much as in him lieth; though he may not of his own authority in the fervency of his zeal kill the same; yet being so persuaded in conscience by such presumptions and assured persuasions, as he may be, and I was; that thereby he should be an instrument as Joab was to take away such a Seba, as Reg cap XX (or an Ahad to Eglon, or Phinees) for the preservation of David, his royal prince, the wealth of his country; especially for the glory of God, as I was, I think at this time; he may do it, and to be warranted by the word of God, I being persuaded as before, if I had killed him, the act had been lawful by God's law, if not by man's law; and I would not have repented me of the same deed. 56

When a similar attempt was made in the next month by printer Robert Asplin, who felt "moved by the spirit" to kill his master John Day, Archbishop

Parker ordered the Stationers' Company to ascertain whether a certain book, first printed under Queen Mary, was being reissued.[57]

Given such a climate of opinion it is not surprising that English Protestants in these years produced no native works of resistance theory in the style of Knox or even Humphrey. However the topic was kept before the eyes of the English reading public in different ways.

Continental Protestant Imports

One of the most important ways by which Englishmen had access to ideas on resistance was through the writings of Continental Protestants in English translation. Works by foreign Reformers on religious topics were very popular in the first few decades of Elizabeth's reign and were a vital means of spreading Puritan doctrine. Coming from respected authors these writings were more difficult for ecclesiastical authorities to repudiate.[58] Many of these European works offered significant contributions on the question of obedience.[59]

The most popular of the foreign Reformers, in terms of their works receiving English translations, was John Calvin.[60] His Institutes of the Christian Religion was translated by Thomas Norton, Cranmer's son-in-law and an ardent Puritan who was to be much involved as an M.P., in 1561.[61] Norton's work was based on Calvin's 1559 Latin edition which the author

considered to be the definitive version, and which, significantly, contained more justification of resistance than any previous edition. The work had previously defended both the actions of the divinely-inspired tyrannicide and the inferior magistrate in withstanding tyranny. Those who kill, moved by the spirit of God, were not to be condemned for they did not "violate that majestie which is planted in kinges by the ordinance of God: but being armed from heaven they subdued the lesser power with the greater."[62] While condemning the uninspired resistance of private men Calvin sanctioned action by representative institutions, such as the classical ephors and tribunes or the Estates of modern Europe, charged with the office of withstanding "the outraging licentiousnesse of Kings".[63] Failure by these institutions to repress tyrants would constitute a breach of faith. Calvin bolstered his defence of such actions with a passage that appeared for the first time in the 1559 edition of the Institutes and which Norton translated for his English audience. Maintaining that disobedience to kings was not wrong when they trespassed against what belonged only to God, Calvin praised the actions of the disobedient Daniel because "the King had passed his boundes, and had not only ben a wrong doer to men, but in lifting up hys hornes against God he had taken awaye power from hymselfe. On the other side the Israelite are condemned, because they were too much obedient to the wicked commaundement of the

King."[64] The gloss on this particular verse (Daniel 6:22) is given more emphasis by Calvin in his 1561 commentary on the Book of Daniel which was given an English translation by Arthur Golding in 1570. Calvin's justification of disobedience is stated strikingly:

> For earthly Princes deprive themselves of all authority when they rise up against God, yea they are unworthy to be counted amongest the company of men. We ought rather to spit in their faces, then to obey them where they deale so proudly and stubbernly, that they will spoyle God of his right, and as it were occupy hys throne, as though they could plucke him downe from heaven. 65

As well as the seven complete editions of Norton's translation which appeared during Elizabeth's reign, there were also several abridgements of Calvin's Institutes.[66] That version produced by Edmund Bunny condensed the resistance content of the work to this:

> Howsoever this one thing alwaies lieth on private men, that they obey their princes whatsoever they be, yet this letteth not, but that there may be some popular Magistrates, in whose power it is to resist the crueltie of Kings, and to defend the libertie of the people. 67

Other of Calvin's biblical commentaries appeared in translation in Elizabethan England and, while not as explicit on the subject of resistance as the Institutes, do offer views on the matter in passing. Calvin's commentary on the Gospels treats, with some caution, the natural law argument of self-defence on which Melanchthon had grounded his defence of resistance and admits that it is lawful to repel unjust violence with violence.[68] His work on the Book of Acts

produced this defence of Protestant actions against the Catholic accusation that the reformed religion subverted kings and civil government:

> But if at any time religion enforce us to resist tyrannicall edicts and commaundements, which forbid us to give due honour to Christ and due worshippe to God: we may then justly say for our selves, that wee are not rebellious against Kings: for they be not so exalted, that they may goe about like Gyants to pull God out of his seat and throne. 69

Calvin's sermons on Deuteronomy contained an interesting atack on inherited kingship, and on choosing an idolater to rule, as well as the command to suppress idolatry and punish the perpetrators.[70]

Another interesting Continental justification of resistance which found an Elizabethan translator was Pierre Viret's A Christian Instruction. Viret, a French reformer, was one of those with whom Knox had discussed the question of obedience during his excursion of 1554. Viret, in an examination of conflicts in obedience resolved the problem by reference to the Two Tables of the Decalogue. The commandments, said Viret, are of two sorts: the first four which concern our duty to God; and the other six, dealing with human relations . If there is a conflict, the second table must always give way to the first, as in the case of ungodly commands by magistrates. The Biblical example of Phineas,cited by Marian resistance writers, shows how violence can be excused.

> Phineas in like sorte was greatly commended by God, for the whore and the whore master which he did slea, and was not rebuked as a murderer, for so much as he did it not of hatred, nor of any bloudie affection, but onely for the dutie and obedience

> which he ought to God, who had bene greatly dishonored, if that such a villainy had not been punished and revenged by him with such a zeale. Thou maist then know...howe that the worke which may seem unto men to have some shew of wickednesse, to be contrary to the commandements of God, is not at all wicked in the sight of God, nor in the judgement of those which take the law of God in his true meaning, and doe know how to rule the second Table by the first, but is pleasant and agreable to his will. 71

Heinrich Bullinger's collection of sermons, the Decades, had reached England, in part, under King Edward but received a complete translation in the reign of Elizabeth. Interesting in the light of the two Puritan assassination attempts of four years earlier is the 1577 translation of the sixth sermon, second decade, where Bullinger admits the role of inspired killers who set God's people free, while cautioning the zealous to be sure of their divine calling before attacking a tyrant.[72]

The European Protestant with the most commentary on the subject of resistance translated into English was Peter Martyr, a reformer with a long history of influence on the church in England. During the Marian exile notes from lectures on the Book of Judges had been published as The Treatise of the Cohabitacyon and in the early years of the rule of Queen Elizabeth a translation of Martyr's Latin commentaries on Judges appeared.[73] These Commentaries contain a detailed defence of the concept of the inferior magistracy and its duty to withstand tyranny. Martyr met objections to his theory in this way:

> But thou wilt say: by what lawe doo inferiour Princes resist either the Emperour or Kynges, or elles

> publique wealthes, when as they defend the syncere religion and true faith? I aunswer by the law of the Emperour, or by the lawe of the king, or by the law of the publique wealth. For they are chosen of Emperours, Kinges, and publique wealthes, as helpers to rule, whereby Justice may more and more florishe. And therfore were they ordeyned according to the office committed unto them rightly, justly, and godly to governe the publyke wealthe. Wherefore they doo according to their duty, when in cause of religion they resist the higher power.[74]

These inferior officers whose duty it was to act against a superior ruler ignoring his "covenants and promises" were said to have existed in many times and places, as Martyr adduced examples from Rome, Denmark and England.[75] Martyr was careful to rule out any action by private citizens, condemning Brutus and Cassius, and warning that the Biblical example of Jehu was not to be imitated. However he did admit that not all killing was to be termed murder and that it was right for violence to be repelled by violence. An ordinary man acting in self-defence was not to be regarded as a private citizen but as one armed by the magistrate.[76]

A commentary on Paul's epistle to the Romans, where the Apostle equated obedience to the powers that be with obedience to God, would seem a strange place to seek an explicit avowal of the right to resistance. Yet this is what one finds in Peter Martyr's commentary on that book of the Bible.[77] In his discussion of St. Paul's dictum on obedience Martyr appears at first to be urging no resistance whatsoever. Evil rulers were said to be agents of God as much as any legitimate king and readers were forbidden to

even attempt flight from a tyrant's prison. Tyranny was preferable to anarchy. It was unlawful for a private man to kill a tyrant, as David's behaviour toward Saul demonstrated. But, however much Martyr forbade the sword to ordinary men, there were those who could resist.

> Howbeit I speake not this, that I think superior powers can not be put down by inferior magistrates, or that they can not be constrained to doe theyr duety of those which are appoynted either kepers, or authors, or electors of Princes, if they transgresse the endes and limites of the power which they have received. As in times past at Rome the Senate and people of Rome were wont to do, and at this day in Germanie, the Electors of the Emperor use sometimes to doe. 79

Martyr's exposition of the rights of the inferior magistracy reappeared in The Common Places of...Peter Martyr published in English in 1583. The lengthy passage from his commentary on Judges which cited Roman, Danish, Imperial and English examples of just revolt and which forbade private men's resistance is reprinted[80] but the book also included more material on the subject of disobedience. This comes in a discussion of the question of Jehoiada's deposition of Athaliah, a favourite theme of Ponet and the Geneva Bible, and of whether godly men were to endure tyranny.

In the Book of Chronicles, Jehoiada, the High Priests, hides the child heir to the throne, sought after by the blood-thirsty usurper Queen Athaliah. Years later Jehoiada reveals the child to the nobility and people who then turn on the usurper and her priests of Baal, killing them and restoring the rightful heir.

Martyr defends these actions by noting that Jehoiada was not a private man but an official charged with affairs both of the church and state. Moreover in his conspiracy he was aided by the priestly class, nobles, and army officers, the sort of person by which "it was mete that the Common weale or Kingdom of Juda shoulde be delivered from that womans Tyrannie."[81] If this profusion of inferior magistrates were not enough to legitimate the enterprise, Martyr then pointed out certain defects in Athaliah's claim to the throne, defects which Knox and Goodman had discovered in the claim of Queen Mary. Athaliah, Martyr explained, was a foreigner and thus, by the precepts on kingship set out in the Book of Deuteronomy, she should not have been allowed to rule. Martyr went on: "Besides this it happened that she not onelie was a stranger, but an Idolatres and that incurable: wherfore she was worthie to be deposed by the primates and peeres of the Kingdome."[82] The murder of the Queen and her priests, much of it committed in the temple, was excused on the grounds that a quick slaughter was preferable to civil war.

Martyr uses his discussion of the enduring of tyranny by godly men to forbid private citizens the right to resist. This however necessitates an explanation of the numerous examples of Old Testament violent action. The Maccabees' war against their ruler was termed a national defence of law, while the violence of the Book of Judges was a series of

deeds by men "driven by the spirit of God".[83] Resistance, in Martyr's view was to be limited to divinely-inspired deliverers or to those officers in a commonwealth whose duty it was to resist.

Defence of Foreign Reformation

The wars of religion which plagued Europe from the 1560's onward produced in England a variety of literature which defended Protestant resistance in practice. In order to win support for foreign Calvinists in their armed struggle against Catholic forces, or in order to justify English government intervention, a number of books were published on the situation in France, the Netherlands and Scotland, and on the justifiability of resistance.

Among the first of such apologies was the 1562 translation of a statement by the rebellious French magnate, the Prince de Condé.[84] In it Condé claimed that he took up arms to rescue the captive royal family and to defend the laws, especially those touching religion. He noted the massacre of innocent Protestants at Vassy and maintained that nothing less than the extermination of all of his faith was being plotted.[85] This appeal to the right of self-defence continued in translations of Huguenot tracts published after the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. Among these was a work by Francis Hotman, who had taught in Strasbourg during the time of the English exile colony, published pseudonomously in 1573.[86] Hotman attacks

the French King for his unprecedented cruelty and treachery, and praises the inhabitants of La Rochelle for their refusal to accept a royal garrison. They claimed they would obey the King only when he had wrested himself from Guise control and then only in those things "wherin our consciences which are dedicate to God alone shall not be wounded in which case we will rather forsake the earth than heaven and our fraile and transitorie houses rather than heavenly mansions."[87] The law of nature which sanctioned self-defence was said to permit them to take up arms and resist those who did the bidding of the Guise.

As well as this argument from the right to self-defence, this literature also produced a defence of the rights of the inferior magistracy. In one anonymous tract appeared some of the constitutional theories of Francis Hotman as he had outlined them in his Franco-Gallia.[88] It is explained that in the past French kings had been chosen by the people and were subject to deposition, which power now resided "in the states of the people and in the publique assembly of the Realme."[89] Kings were created to rule within firm guide-lines and could do nothing without the consent of the Estates. Then followed an astonishing passage to find in a book published openly in Elizabethan England. Hotman attacked the laws that allowed women to inherit the throne, and lamented the ruin and disorder attendant on their rule.[90] What makes the inclusion of this passage all the

more striking is that in Hotman's Latin original the author expressly restricted his attack to French examples, claiming that the British did not "distinguish between the sexes in government".[92] Considering that the other major Huguenot resistance tract Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos received an English translation only in those parts which would justify English interference in the French civil war with an added warning that resistance to one's own prince was wicked,[92] the publication of Hotman's theories seems very bold indeed.

The struggle of the Calvinists in the Netherlands against their Spanish overlord also produced works in English championing their resistance. The most notable of these was the apology of William of Orange, probably the work of Hubert Languet, a man suggested as a possible author of the Vindiciae. In this work William defended his resistance to King Philip, whom he accused o incest and child murder, and whom he termed a "tyraunt...not to be suffered on the earth".[93] William based his disobedience on constitutional grounds claiming that in the Low Countries Philip had to rule by law and consult his subjects. Such was the strength of the local liberties that Philip might be resisted as were Spartan kings by the ephors. Nobles of the Netherlands were thus bound to force their overlord to render equity and justice or themselves be guilty of perjury and rebellion against the Estates.[94]

Works by foreign Protestants justifying violent

resistance to their rulers have, so far, been seen to rest on constitutional grounds, limiting action to the inferior magistrate. This however is not the case in a defence of Scottish Protestants in the actions taken against their Queen, written by George Buchanan and which appeared in a London edition in 1581.[95] His De jure regni apud Scotos establishes, in response to an expression of horror at the treatment of Mary Queen of Scots, the right of the people to depose wicked rulers, and asserts that this right had often been put into practice in Scotland. Like Ponet, Buchanan argues that sovereignty rests in the people, by whom the king is chosen,[96] and that, should the ruler abuse his position of trust, he may be set aside or killed.[97] This resistance may be the act of the people as a whole, or the work of a single tyrannicide. Like Ponet ,Buchanan shrugs off the lack of explicit Scriptural sanction for such killings, but, unlike his English predecessor, Buchanan is not very concerned about the role of religion in his political thought.[98]

Another work by a Scotsman in defence of his countrymen's handling of their rulers also appeared in England in the 1580's. However, while Buchanan's work was widely praised, even at Elizabeth's court,[99] John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland was seized while still on the presses by government agents in 1587 and banned from distribution.[100] The book contained several passages in which the right to resistance in defence of religion was strongly argued.

Knox prints the reply to a proclamation by Mary of Guise in 1559 branding the Scottish Protestants as traitors, in which it is maintained that they who "do bridle those inordinate appetites of Princes, can not be accused as resistaries of the authoritie." It was said to be the duty of the nobles, councillors, barons "and people whose willes and consentes are to be required in all great and weightie matters of the common wealth" to appose princes commanding things against the law of God.[101] This appeal to the rights of the Scottish inferior magistracy was reaffirmed when Knox recounted his reply, and that of fellow preacher and Marian exile John Willock, to a question on the legitimacy of the deposition of the Queen Regent: Willock accused her of ignoring her council, forgetting her duty to provide her subjects with true religion, and with idolatry, saying that he could see no reason why "the borne counsellers, Nobility and Barons of the realme might not justly deprive her from all regiment and authoritie amongst them." Knox agreed, with the caution that Mary's repentance, should it ever occur, ought to win her back that of which she had been deprived.[102]

Aside from these more reasoned outlines of resistance theory, Knox also included in his History an approving account of an important assassination, the 1546 killing of Cardinal Beaton which Knox called a "godly facte". Knox described how the Cardinal was first assaulted by two angry Scottish Protestants

who were then stopped by a third:

> James Melvin (a man of nature most gentle, and most modest) perceaving them both in choler, withdrew them and said, This worke and judgement of God (althoghe it be secret) ought to be done with greater gravitie. And presenting unto him the point of the sword, said, Repent thee of thy former wicked life, but especiallie of the sheding of the bloud of that notable instrument of God Maister George Wisehart, which albeit the flame of fire consumed before men, yet cries it a vengeance upon thee, and we from God are sent to revenge it. For here before my God I protest, that neither the hatred of thy person, the love of thy riches, nor the feare of anie trouble thou couldest have done to me in particular, moved or moveth me to strike thee: But onely because thou hast bene and remainest an obstinate enemie against Christ Jesus and his holie Gospell. And so he stroke him twise or thrise through with a stog sword: and so he fell, never word heard out of his mouth, but I am a priest, fie, fie, all is gone. 103

Appearing at a time when Puritan pressure was mounting for drastic reform in church government, it is not surprising that a book containing arguments for resistance for the sake of religion and the detailed description of the murder of a prelate should be ordered seized by Archbishop Whitgift.[104]

However it was not foreign Protestants alone who defended their rights to resist; English Protestant clergymen also maintained that their Scottish, Dutch, and French correligionists had the right to take up arms. John Jewel, former exile and first Elizabethan bishop of Salsbury, was forced in 1567 to defend his famous Apology against Catholic charges that Protestants were naturally rebellious. In so doing Jewel claimed that Protestants did not teach the people to rebel "but only to defend themselves by all lawful means against oppression, as did David against King

Saul. So do the nobles in France at this day. They seek not to kill, but to save their own lives, as they have openly protested by public writing unto the world."[105] Jewel also termed these actions by foreign Protestants defence of themselves in defence of Christ.[106]

After the appearance of the papal bull of 1570 which declared Elizabeth deposed and the publication of Dr. Nicholas Sanders' De Visibli Monarchia which defended the rights of popes to depose heretical rulers, English Protestant controversialists could take the offensive and accuse English Catholic exiles of supporting sedition. While engaged in such an attack on Catholics Thomas Stapleton and Nicholas Sanders, decrying their rebellious doctrines, John Bridges conceded certain rights of resistance. The first case would excuse his correligionists in certain European countries:

> The state of some Kingdomes are such, I graunt that the Princes regement is but conditional, and he so wel bounde to the electors of him, and other peeres or estates in his Signorie, as they to him, and either parties sworne in his Coronation, not onely to observe those conditions but to persecute or remove the violater of them. 107

The second instance of justifiable resistance occured in a discussion of the rebellion of the high priest Jehoiada against Queen Athaliah. Bridges was reluctant to view this as an example of the deposition of a heretic (for this might encourage English Catholics against their queen) and saw it instead as the removal of a murderous usurper, who had no right to the crown.

> This fact therfore of Joiada, can not be drawne to an ordinarie example, except in these points, that every good subject, so much as in him lyeth, shoulde preserve the lawfull kings children and heires, and not suffer any other to whom the inheritance belongeth not, to usurpe the crown, but the right and lawful heire thereof to enjoy it, and to expell al intruders and usurpers, chiefly such tyrants as seeke their usurpation by excrable murthering. 108

Thomas Bilson was as eager as Bridges to attack Catholic resistance theory but he conceded, in his own way, even more than Bridges had. Bilson's True Difference[109] takes the form of a dialogue between Theophilus, a Christian, and Philander, a Jesuit. Philander, in defence of the position of Cardinal William Allen that the deposition of Elizabeth was lawful, cites numerous examples of Protestant resistance writings ranging from Zwingli to Knox and Goodman. Theophilus is placed in the position of having to refute Catholic theory, while explaining Protestant theory and defending its application. In essence his position is that claims for the papal power of deposition are invalid and seditious, and that Continental Reformers have advocated only such resistance as was lawful in their countries. His defence of Dutch, French, and Scottish rebellions amounts to an embarrassingly large range of action for Protestant inferior magistrates.

> If a Prince should goe about to subject his kingdome to a forraigne Realme, or change the forme of the common wealth, from imperie to tyrannie: or neglect the Lawes established by common consent of Prince and people, to execute his owne pleasure: In these and other cases, which might be named, if the Nobles and commons joyne togither to defend their auncient and accustomed libertie, regiment and lawes, they may not well be counted rebels. 110

Like Bridges, Bilson deals with Scriptural examples of resistance such as Jehoiada against Queen Athaliah and Jehu against King Ahab and Queen Jezebel. Rather than admit an example of a high priest deposing a ruling heretic Bilson points out that Jehoiada acted as an inferior magistrate, bound by ties of kinship to the true royal line, supported by the political nation, to resist a usurper.[111] Jehu was not an instance of a rebel authorized by a priest or prophet but a tyrannicide authorized by God to slay the ruling family and take the throne.[112]

Elizabethan Histories

The Elizabethan love of histories also provided opportunities for English readers to encounter theories and examples of resistance against tyrants. One of the first histories published in the reign of Queen Elizabeth was Johann Sleidan's A Famous Cronicle[113] which reveals much of the thinking on resistance by German Protestants in the 1530's and 1540's. Luther's Warnung of 1531 is mentioned as a book advocating the right to self-defence, with a marginal note claiming that the law itself occasionally permitted the inferior magistrate to resist the superior.[114] This appeal to the powers of the inferior magistrate is again mentioned in the light of the Magdeburg Bekenntnis[115] and the apology of the Protestant princes for their actions against the Emperor in 1546.

> For considering that he intendeth destruction both to Religion and libertie: he geveth an occasion, wherby we may resist him with a good conscience. For in this case it is lawful to resist, as it is proved both by sacred and prophane histories. For God is not the authour of unjust violence, neither are we bounden to him otherwyse, than if he fulfyll the conditions, for the whiche he was created Emperour. 116

English chronicles too contained examples of opposition to tyrannous rulers. The atrocities of William the Conqueror, which were clearly in the minds of the writers of the Marian exile, were recounted in the Chronicles of Raphael Holinshed. The invader's actions in taking away the armour, laws, and wealth of the natives prompted English rebels to vow to die rather than submit themsáves to servitude and bondage. The men of Kent, inspired, according to Holinshed, by the example of the Maccabees, resisted the tyrant until he was forced to concede them their accustomed liberties.[117] The articles of deposition of Richard II are extensively listed (including the king's "fantasticall opinion" that the laws of the realm were in his own head or breast) as is Richard's admission that he was not unworthy of his fate.[118] Of Richard III it was said that he was a tyrant "whome it had beene more honorable to have soppressed than supported."[119] Despite his statement that Wyatt's rising was against God's wish that the magistrate be revered, Holinshed comes very close to supporting Marian rebels. He speaks of the Duke of Suffolk and others who opposed the thralldom of foreigners as "true Englishmen", refuted Queen Mary's claim that

Wyatt's men sought only loot, and referred the reader to the 1555 resistance tract Warning to England.[120]

Nowhere was the power of history to draw attention to resistance theory more clearly illustrated than in the case of John Hayward's book on the deposition of Richard II.[121] Dedicated, in a provocative way, to the Earl of Essex (who was to pay Shakespeare's company to stage Richard II on the eve of his rebellion), Hayward's history brought him to prison and to the rack. His Henrie IV contains arguments both for and against the legitimacy of resistance but the untimeliness of the work and the speech placed in the mouth of the Archbishop of Canterbury who sought to persuade Henry Bolingbroke to depose King Richard caused consternation on its publication. The Archbishop, who had complained of Richard's tyranny calmed Henry's worries over lack of precedents by citing both English and Continental examples of lawful deposition.[122] Even the speeches of Richard's staunchest defender conceded that many states from ancient Sparta to modern Scandinavia allowed nobles and the people to remove evil rulers.[123] Despite Francis Bacon's opinion that Hayward deserved prosecution not for treason but for plagiarising Tacitus, Hayward remained in prison until after the execution of Essex.

Classical Tyrannicide

The classical view that tyranny was the worst of all forms of government and that private citizens might

justly slay tyrants was put forward in a number of books which received English translations in the reign of Elizabeth. Probably the first such was Thomas Hoby's rendering of Castiglione's The Courtier[124] which appeared in 1561. In Book IV it is proposed that the good prince make his people warlike in order to foster self-defence and noble conquest, and to drive out tyrants.[125] When this view is challenged by one who believes such pastimes to be petty occupations the virtues of combatting tyranny are restated in the examples of Theseus and Hercules. It was claimed that "for ridding the world of such intolerable monsters (for Tyrannes ought not to be called by other name) unto Hercules were made Temples, and sacrifices, and godlye honours given him, because the benefit to roote up Tirannes is so profitable to the worlde, that who so doeth it, deserveth a farre greater rewarde, then whatsoever is meete for a mortall man."[126]

A 1594 translation of Justus Lipsius' Politicorum libri sex outlined two ways of dealing with tyrants. While the author felt that passive suffering was the wiser course, he could not condemn the tyrannicide.

> I do not reprehend him, knowing, that the Grecians did attribute like honour as they did to their gods, to him who had slaine a tyrant. Likewise I heare the tragicall Poet, who saieth, there can no more liberall nor richer sacrifice be offered to Jupiter, then a wicked king. 127

Citing classical, Scriptural, and more contemporary examples of the bad end to which tyrants were bound to come was Politicke, Moral, and Martial Discourses, a translation of the work of Jacaues Hurault.

Particularly striking is the remark attributed to Marcus Aurelius that God permitted wicked princes to be slain more than ordinary men because while private citizens can harm very few "the Prince that is tyrannous and wicked, overthroweth the whole Common-weale."[128]

A call to put this doctrine into practice appeared in 1598 in two editions of a tract by an anonymous Spaniard.[129] A Treatise Paraenetical demanded the overthrow of Philip II of Spain and claimed to show that such a deposition was possible and had ample precedent. The author maintained that to invade a country for reasons of conquest and to enter it in aid of those crying out for liberty were two different matters. Moreover the deposition of a cruel or licentious tyrant required very little force. The English example of this was Henry Tudor's enterprise against Richard III who was "defeated and slaine most shamefully, by reason of his cruelty and tyranny."[130] French, Danish, and Spanish examples of wicked kings easily deprived of their thrones were also added in support of the call to act against Philip.

Later Puritans and Resistance Writings

Finally the writings of English Puritans in the last half of Elizabeth's reign must be considered. It has been shown that, aside from the Geneva Bible, which continued to be published throughout the reign, and the writings of Laurence Humphrey immediately

after the exile, there was no attempt at justification of resistance by the hotter sort of English Protestant throughout the crises that marked the first two decades of Elizabeth's reign. For the most part this attitude continued. On occasion, however, a crisis would call forth language very close to a doctrine of resistance and even more rare occasions would see an authentic defence of the right to resist.

An example of a tract with suggestive language is Anthony Gilby's A Pleasant Dialogue in which Puritan objections to the state of the English Church are set forth. When it is suggested by the character Sir Miles Blynkarde, the defender of the status quo, that the magistrate has the right to command, the Puritan spokesman Miles Monopodios replies that both he who commands and he who obeys have their limits. The ruler is to be obeyed only as long as he performs his true office of maintaining the good and punishing the evil.[131] In language ominously reminiscent of the Marian exiles, one of which he had been, Gilby notes that all the people were bound to obey Moses in destroying idolaters, and Jehu in killing the priests of Baal but that "no man was bound to obeye Jeroboam, Ahab, Jehoram, Ahaz, or any of the wicked kings, commaunding any superstition or idolatrie."[132] However, Gilby goes on to soften the implications of this statement by specifying that all disobedience be passive and prayerful "without any resisting".[133]

Also resembling the thinking of the Marian exiles was John Stubbs' tract against the Alençon marriage,

A Gaping Gulf.[134] Like Knox, Stubbs argued that the only source of political knowledge and action ought to be the Bible and that Scripture forbade the choice of a foreign king.[135] Catherine de Medici was likened to Queen Athaliah while the actions of Asa in his deposition of Queen Maacha and his iconoclasm were commended to Elizabeth. Like many of the Marian exiles Stubbs predicted that a foreign king would displace the native nobility, replace English law with civil law, send Englishmen to fight abroad and impose new financial burdens on the country.[136] Despite these charges Stubbs' call to action consisted only of the nobility advising the Queen against the French marriage, the clergy preaching the word of God and the people prayerfully abiding "in all subjection and peaceable patience".[137] Stubbs' passivity is emphasized by his actions at his judicial mutilation where, having had one hand stricken off for having written his tract, he doffed his cap with his remaining hand and shouted, "God save the Queen!".

A similar tension between bold language and passive conclusions can be seen in John Penry's address to the Lord President of Wales, the Earl of Pembroke.[138] Penry told Pembroke that they "have no allowance to be rulers, wher the Lord is not served, where he hath no commission from him to beare rule."[139] If Pembroke was not inclined to bring Wales into the true religion, then he ought not be Lord President thereof. Penry, however, denied that his remarks

constituted any criticism of the civil order and that, if necessary, he would lose his life ten thousant times in her defence.[140] In the end he was required to spend his life only once, as Elizabeth's government executed him in 1593 for his offensive writings.

Despite the manifest reluctance to preach resistance against Elizabeth for her slackness in religion there are examples of Puritan advocacy of the doctrine when it was not aimed at the Queen. Laurence Humphrey, attacking Catholic resistance theory in the year 1588, nonetheless conceded there were occasions in which violence might be used by "such as bear the person of publicke power by the Lawes of God, or of any which is moved certainely and called thereunto by a special inspiration of the holy Ghost, or for that authority which did choose and ordaine that governour, or in any such like case and cause."[141] There were also Protestant avowals of the right to resist usurpers. Robert Browne declared that "any usurper were wholy to bee rejected and withstoode, if hee shoulde get from Her Majestie her royall dignity and crowne, or laye clayme therunto."[142] Francis Hastings, in the midst of a controversy with the Jesuit resistance theorist Robert Parsons, denied that the clergy had any right to depose princes but that "usurpers may be suppressed by rightfull inheritance, as Athaliah by Hehoiada, and in our land Richard the third, by Henrie the seventh."[143] However the most interesting and complete of the discussions of

resistance by an English Protestant at this time is that produced by Puritan divine Dudley Fenner.

Fenner was a brilliant young preacher whose career had been marked by tribulations brought on by his nonconformity. Archbishop Whitgift, beseiged by a gang of Puritan clerics objecting to his policies, had told Fenner that he was "as bad as the worst"[144] and eventually suspended and imprisoned him. Upon release Fenner embarked upon another self-imposed exile (he had earlier spent time in Antwerp) and became preacher to the English congregation at Middleburgh. Before his untimely death there, Fenner published his Sacra Theologica, an attempt to systematize Puritan theology.[145] In its considerations on "civil policy" the book resurrects some of the ideas of the Genevan exiles and strongly affirms the duty to resist idolatry and tyranny.

Central to Fenner, as it had been to the Genevan writers, was a belief that Old Testament injunctions and examples still retained their power to command in the sixteenth century. For instance, the murder of Queen Athaliah and her idolatrous priests was cited, as it had been in 1558 and 1559, to show how the covenant between man and God demanded that those who disobeyed the will of God be killed.[146] The Old Testament also taught how a tyrant by usurpation was to be dealt with. "Such a one it is lawful for everie private man to resist, and also if he be abl to kil him", at least until the usurper is established

and recognized.[147] A tyrant by oppression, one "that of set purpose violateth or overthroweth al, or the most principal covnants decreed of the common wealth", was subject to a different form of restraint. "Such a one must they that have that authoritie, as the Ephori or princes of the kingdom or a public assemblie of al estates and degrees in the land either peaceablie, or by force of armes and war, quite dispossess and remoov."[148] Though Fenner backs up this assertion with a Scriptural reference it is interesting to note how he refers to Calvin's Spartan "ephors".

Fenner later distinguishes between two types of inferior magistrates: the "ephori or officers of the kingdom", and provincial governors. It is the duty of the ephors to restrain the ruler should he "either subvert the religion and worship of God, or oppress either the church or commonwealth".[149] They must faithfully advise the king and ensure that those things decided in consultation are carried out. Moreover it was Fenner's view of the power of the inferior magistracy that no weighty business or matters touching the public good be dealt with "without the publick assemblie of al the degrees and estates in the Kingdom".[150] As to provincial governors, they were to ensure, as Penry had urged the Earl of Pembroke, that their subjects practised the true religion, but they also had a duty to keep their charges from being oppressed by tyranny.[151]

The Last Years

After the publication of a second edition of Fenner's Sacra Theologica in 1589 until the end of Elizabeth's reign, the number of books commenting on resistance theory was much smaller than had been the case throughout the 1570's and 1580's.[152] There are several reasons for this. One of the chief vehicles for the spread of such ideas had been the translations of works by Continental Protestants. Such translations however were in decline and were no longer the predominating force in theological publishing which they had been in the early years of the reign.[153] Secondly, as time progressed there was less need for Englishmen to defend the rights of the inferior magistracy. Scotland was, by the 1590's, firmly Protestant and France's great rebel Henry of Navarre was now Henry IV in arms against Catholic insurgents. However the greatest reason for a decline in resistance writings was the established Church's attack on Puritanism, and particularly the onslaught led by Richard Bancroft.

The campaign conducted by Whitgift against the presbyterian movement, coupled with the death of Puritan patrons such as Leicester, Walsingham and Warwick and the diminution of the Catholic menace after the failure of the Armada, had the movement in the last decade of the sixteenth century in disarray and on the defensive.[154] Part of this campaign was the attempt, headed by Richard Bancroft, to link

presbyterianism with sedition by citing Calvinist resistance writings. The opening salvo in this battle was fired in Parliament as early as 1587 by Christopher Hatton. In a speech opposing ecclesiastical reform written by his chaplain Bancroft, Hatton told the House that the Queen knew the political dangers of presbyterianism. Did she not know the content of De jure regni apud Scotos, Beza's Du droit des magistrats, and Vindiciae contra tyrannos?[155] In what way, Hatton asked, were these works different from those of the papists? Both denied princely supremacy. Bancroft followed this up by a sermon at Paul's Cross in 1589 in which he linked Ponet, Viret, Martin Marprelate, Buchanan, Gilby and Huguenot writers in a conspiracy to impose presbyterianism.[156] Claimed Bancroft:

> Her majestie is depraved, hir authoritie is impugned, and great dangers are threatned. Civill government is called into question: princes prerogatives are curiously scanned: the interest of the people in kingdoms is greatly advanced: and all government generally is pinched at and contemned. 157

The plot by Edmund Copinger and Henry Arthington to proclaim the new messiah, William Hacket, and depose Queen Elizabeth again gave Bancroft the opportunity to smear Puritanism by associating it with sedition.[158] To Bancroft and his colleague Richard Cosin this plot was merely the latest in a series of attempts to establish presbyterianism, and all that it implied, by force.[159] Citing Anabaptists, Genevan exiles under Mary,[160] Huguenot theorists, and contemporary Puritans, Bancroft and Cosin tried to demonstrate

that the appeal for a violent reformation was a hallmark of the hotter sort of gospeller. Though their arguments were unfair and the evidence both scanty and forced,[161] these books, and proceedings which took a similar line, were effective. The Puritan movement was on the defensive and its leaders very reluctant to be associated in any way with the question of resistance.[162]

Conclusion

Despite Bancroft's accusations very little of the Protestant resistance theory published for English readers from 1559 to 1603 was directed against the Elizabethan regime -- the writings of Knox in 1559 are an obvious exception to this and the timing of the publication of his History must lead to some suspicion. In the main, resistance theory was of interest to English Protestants because of its connection with the defence of the Reformation against Catholic enemies, not only with regard to actual foreign situations but, perhaps, to a possible English situation as well. With the constant threat of a Catholic succession posed by Mary Queen of Scots or Philip II, it would be surprising if English Protestants did not view resistance theory as something useful to be kept in the public mind in case of emergency, but otherwise not for internal consumption.[163] That the full range of theories directed against Mary could be openly published under Elizabeth (until the government chose to link presbyterianism with treason) shows that the

authorities recognized the usefulness of resistance theory to English Protestantism.

CHAPTER IV: NOTES

1. Dr. Williams Library Ms., Morrice Collection, "C", f. 634; Knox, Works, vol. VI, p. 5; Robinson, ed., Zurich Letters, p. 35.
2. Ridley, John Knox, p. 290. Letters from Jean Morel and Francis Hotman, Joannis Calvini Opera, ed. Baun, Cunitz and Reuss, vol. XVII (Brunswick: 1877), pp. 396-97 and 541.
3. M.M. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago: 1970), p. 171. Even in 1566 Beza could tell Bullinger that Elizabeth's displeasure toward Geneva continued, partly as a result of Knox and Goodman's works being written in that city. Robinson, ed., Zurich Letters, p. 131.
4. John Bruce, ed., Correspondence of Matthew Parker (Cambridge: 1853), pp. 60-61.
5. There is slight indication that the ideas of Knox and Goodman had won some approval. Strype claims that the books "found many approvers: which did the protestants very ill service, in making the court jealous of a reformation." Annals of the Reformation, 4 vol.(Oxford: 1824), vol. I, part 1, p. 177. The returned exile John Pullain, an old associate of Goodman and Bartlett Greene, according to Fuller, was arrested "for maintaining, in a sermon of his some of the saide disliked points". Albert Peel, ed., The Seconde Parte of a Register, col. 2 (Cambridge: 1915), p. 59.
6. Bruce, ed., Parker Correspondence, p. 66.

7. Cited in Richard Watson Dixon, History of the Church of England From the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction, vol. V (Oxford: 1902), p. 114n.
8. Ibid., pp. 114n-115n.
9. Those who had attacked Mary's claim to rule on the grounds of her violation of Henry VIII's will, her bastardy, her breaking of the coronation oath, or her unconstitutional actions could argue that the Queen was no legitimate ruler commanding lawful things and those advocating resistance by the inferior magistrate could consider their actions proper in the light of this declaration.
10. Laurence Humphrey, De religionis conservatione et reformatione vera (Basle: 1559). Humphrey had lived much of his exile in Basle where this work was written though he spent the latter part of 1558 at Geneva where he met Knox and Goodman whom he treats with charity throughout the book.
11. Ibid., pp. 77 and 82.
12. Ibid., pp. 83-85. Like Calvin, in his Institutes, Humphrey cited the example of the Spartan Ephors as a body constituted to act against errant kings.
13. Ibid., p. 96.
14. Ibid., p. 99.
15. Published in Basle in 1559 as Optimates, the work reappeared in English translation as The Nobles or of the Nobility (London: 1563). All citations are from the 1563 edition.
16. Ibid., Sig. M7v.

17. Ibid., Sig. D1v. Laurence Humphrey's involvement with resistance theory did not end with the writing of these two books in 1559. During the progress of Queen Elizabeth to Oxford in 1566 Humphrey took part in a disputation on the question "An privato homini liceat arma sumere contra malum Principem?", arguing in the negative. Against a battery of theologians who defended resistance with arguments from the Old Testament, the classics, and natural law, Humphrey advanced the claims of obedience and, not surprisingly, carried the day. John Nichols, The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth, vol. I (London: 1823), pp. 231-243.
18. The most famous of the early attacks on Knox is the anonymous An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjectes (Strasbourg: 1559) written by the former exile and future Bishop of London, John Aylmer. Though Aylmer is gentle with Knox personally, as was Humphrey, there is little sign that he imbibed much resistance theory during his continental stay.
19. Knox, Works, vol. VI, pp. 19, 45 and 49-50. Knox maintained in letters to the Queen and William Cecil that if Elizabeth continued to base her rule on custom or law, divine anger would result.
20. John Knox, The Copie of An Epistle Sent By John Knox One of the Ministers of the Englishe Church at Geneva unto the inhabitants of Newcastle and Barwicke. In the end wherof is added a briefe exhortation to

England for the spedie embrasing of Christes Gospel heretofore suppressed and banished (Geneva: 1559).

21. Ibid., p. 53.
22. Ibid., p. 75. It is here that Knox outlines a two-fold covenant: one part between God and the people, and the other between the people and the king, "that the one and the other shulde be the people of the Lord."
23. Ibid., p. 90n.
24. Ibid., p. 93.
25. Ibid., p. 94.
26. Entitled The Bible and Holy Scriptures Conteyned In the Olde And Newe Testament it was printed at Geneva in 1560 by the Englishman Rowland Hall. Geneva continued to be the place of publication for later editions until 1575 when a license to print in London was secured.

    There is a considerable body of literature on the production and content of the Geneva Bible. Among the most helpful are Charles Eason, The Genevan Bible (Dublin: 1937) ; Lewis Lupton, A History of the Geneva Bible, 8 vols. (London: 1966-1976); Basil Hall, The Genevan Version of the English Bible (London: 1957); Hardin Craig Jr., "The Geneva Bible as a Political Document", Pacific Historical Review, vol. 8, 1938, pp. 40-49; Richard L. Greaves, "Traditionalism and the Seeds of Revolution in the Social Principles of the Geneva Bible", The

Sixteenth Century Journal, vol. 7 no. 2, 1976, pp. 94-109; but the best introduction is Lloyd E. Berry, The Geneva Bible, a facsimile of the 1560 edition (Madison: 1969).

27. Lupton, A History of the Geneva Bible, vol. V, p. 133. Though the influence on the Geneva Bible of other Biblical translations and Calvin's commentaries is great (Lupton, A History of the Geneva Bible, vol. III, pp. 143-144, 171-177), there is no evidence that any of the notes approving of violent resistance were the work of other than the Englishmen at Geneva.

28. Berry, The Geneva Bible, p. 14. To emphasize the overwhelming popularity of this Bible in the period before the appearance of the Authorized Version, the Great Bible appeared in only seven, and the official Bishops' Bible, in twenty-two editions between 1560 and 1611.

29. The note to I Kings 21: 15, the unjust killing of Naboth, states: "This example of monstreous crueltie the holy Gost leaveth to us to the intente that we shulde abhorre all tyrannie"; the note on Pharoah's order to slay the Hebrew babies, Exodus 1:22, reads: "When tyrants can not prevaile by craft thei brast forthe into open rage." When Samuel lists the onerous demands that a king will make on his people, I Samuel 8:11, the note comments: "Not that kings have this autoritie by their office, but that suche as reigne in Gods wrath shulde usurpe

this over their brethren contrary to the law."

30. The note to Judges 9:54, the death of Abimelech reads: "Thus God by suche miserable deaths taketh vengeance on tyrants even in this life."
31. This accompanied the story in Acts 4 and 5 of the Apostles forbidden to preach, which Goodman used as the starting point of Superior Powers. See also the note to I Peter 2:18.
32. This note accompanied Christ's rebuke to Peter who had struck one of those coming to take Jesus in Matthew 26:52.
33. Moses' command drew the approving note: "All natural affections must give place to Gods honour."
34. Criticisms of gynocracy might have been expected to accompany the histories of Jezebel and Athaliah or the Pauline injunctions on women's behaviour. The note to I Corinthians 11:10 approves of women's subordination to man and that to I Corinthians 14:34 calls female tumult in church a usurpation but no political conclusions are drawn from these. Interestingly, the latter comment was not present among the notes to the 1557 New Testament from which most of the 1560 marginalia are borrowed.
35. The notes themselves underwent revision in different editions of the Geneva Bible, becoming more Calvinist and more argumentative. In 1576 Lawrence Tomson revised the New Testament and its notes in accordance with those of Theodore Beza and in 1599 new notes accompanied the Book of Revelations. Berry, The Geneva Bible, pp. 15-16. However the Old Testament

notes remained untouched throughout the reign and none of the New Testament changes significantly altered the political content of the notes.

36. Ibid., p. 15. James particularly objected to the note on Exodus 1:19 which commended the midwives in disobeying Pharoah and that condemning the pusillanimity of King Asa. James might have thought the latter note urging the execution of a King's mother to be an unfortunate one in light of the fate of his own mother.

37. John Eadie, The English Bible (London: 1876), vol. II, p. 30.

38. The Holi Bible (London: 1568), notes accompanying I Samuel 26:9; I Kings 15:3; II Chronicles 15:16. The comment on Moses' murder of the tyrannous Egyptian, Exodus 2:12, does seek to limit the lesson of divinely inspired tyrannicides: "By gods appointment...but suche speciall and heroycall facts of the godly men are not to be allowed."

39. The Vestiarian Controversy of the mid-1560's grew out of the reluctance of the Puritan clergy to wear clerical garb which they felt to be popish remnants. The government suspended over one hundred ministers and a pamphlet war ensued. Patrick Collinson, The Elizabethan Puritan Movement (London: 1967), pp. 75-84. The two Admonitions to Parliament were Puritan demands for church reform which sparked off another battle of the presses in 1571. Ibid., pp. 118-121.

40. Crowley, An answere For The Tyme, p. 52.
41. Ibid., pp. 81-82. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, p. 209.
42. Anthony Gilby, To my lovynge brethren (Emden: 1566), Sig. A3v.
43. Crowley's An answere, pp. 39 and 132, cites both Ponet's Shorte Treatise, and Peter Martyr's Judges, which, in lecture form, was the basis of the exile resistance tract, The Cohabitacyon. The anonymous The mynd and exposition of...Martyn Bucer (Emden: 1566), drew on Bucer's commentary on Matthew.
44. Thomas Cartwright, A Seconde admonition to the Parliament (Wandsworth: 1572), Sig. B1.
45. Thomas Dorman, A Proufe of Certayne Articles In Religion (Antwerp: 1564), f. 119. Dorman spent his exile at Louvain, the English college at Douai, and in Tournay where he was given a benefice.
46. Ibid., f. 20.
47. Thomas Stapelton, A Counterblast To M. Hornes Vayne Blaste (Louvain: 1567), ff. 23-25v and 15v. Sandys, archbishop of York, and Horne, bishop of Winchester, were both exiles under Mary. Sandys had been an open supporter of Lady Jane Grey and Horne had also been charged with a political crime. Garrett, The Marian Exiles, pp. 188 and 283. Stapleton, one of the Catholic exile's foremost controversialists, later became an advocate of the papal power to depose princes.
48. John Fowler, tr., An Oration Against the Unlawfull Insurrections of the Protestantes of our time...

By Peter Frarin (Louvain: 1566). Though Frarin's Latin original, Oratio Petri Frarini (Louvain: 1566), made mention of the English situation, Fowler's treatment was much more extensive.

49. Fowler, An Oration, Sigs. D2v, B7v and E5-E5v.

50. Ibid., Sigs. F2-F3. Among a series of woodcuts, depicting Protestant enormities, which closed the tract, was a portrayal of Knox and Goodman sounding trumpets against two enthroned women above the caption "No Queene in her kingdome can or ought to syt fast,/ If Knokes or Goodmans bookes blowe any true blast."

51. G.R. Elton, The Tudor Constitution (Cambridge: 1960), pp. 414-18, prints the 1570 papal bull and a translation.

52. An homilie agaynst disobedience and wylful rebellion (London: 1571), Sig. A4.

53. Collinson, The Elizabethan Puritan Movement, p. 118.

54. British Museum Additional Ms. 29, 546, f. 29. This retraction is dated October 1571, but f. 28, a shorter statement, is dated at Lambeth, 26 April 1571. The October declaration singles out for express denial the belief that a private citizen, on his own authority, might have killed Queen Mary; that the people, on their own authority, might punish magistrates acting against God's law; and that "ordinarilie" God becomes head of the people, giving them the sword, when they seek to enforce His law. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, p. 231, notes

that the subscription (as printed in Strype, Annals, vol. I, pt. 1, pp. 184-85 and vol. II, pt. 1, p. 141), does not affirm the right of a wicked woman to rule and left room for resistance by Parliament or the people in extreme cases. Strype, however, does not print Goodman's entire statement on female rule as expressed in the October retraction, Add. Ms. 29, 546, f. 29.

55. Nicholson, ed., Grindal, p. 327.

56. John Strype, The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, vol. II (Oxford: 1821), p. 328.

57. Bruce, ed., Parker Correspondence, Parker to Burghley, p. 448. The book might well have been Goodman's Superior Powers. Though there is no evidence of this book having an Elizabethan reprinting, manuscript copies did circulate. Dawson, "Christopher Goodman", p. 247. Parker's concern with resistance theory was also expressed in earlier letters to Burghley (Correspondence, pp. 377, 437, and 445), and his thoughts on the "Undertree" conspiracy with its fabulous assassination plots. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, p. 245.

58. William Calderwood, "The Elizabethan Protestant Press: A Study of the Printing and Publishing of Protestant Religious Literature in English, Excluding Bibles and Liturgies, 1558-1603", unpublished London Ph.D. dissertation, 1977, p. 226.

59. It might be asked to what extent were these translations of Continental religious works an attempt

to import European Protestant ideas on resistance into England. After all, these books contained much else that was of interest in the way of devotion, Biblical exegesis, or thoughts on church doctrine and discipline. The reasons why any particular work was deemed worthy of translation for an English audience vary, but it is essential to note that Elizabethan editors and publishers knew when a politically or religiously offensive line of thought had to be deleted from an otherwise worthwhile book. In 1595 William Jones, the translator of Justus Lipsius' Six Bookes of Politickes (London: 1595), omitted the original third chapter of Book Two "for some important cause" which he declined to utter. The chapter, in fact, was on government by women, always a delicate topic in Elizabethan England. A Short Apologie for Christian Soldiers (London: 1588), an excerpt from the Huguenot resistance tract Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos was translated by "H.P." with no mention of its origins, and the potentially seditious passages removed. Sometimes a controversial topic would be published with a warning, as in the case of the Common Places of Christian Religion (London: 1568) of Wolfgang Musculus, translated by John Man. Readers were admonished that while much of the book was wholesome fare, the author had set out "some perticularities, not agreable to the usage of this

our Churche of England" which must not be regarded as binding on all Christians. Sig. 4v. Given, then, that those preparing imported works for an English audience were willing to excise controversial passages it must seem that the material which they did include was thought to be of particular value and interest.

60. Calderwood, "The Elizabethan Protestant Press", p. 151.
61. John Calvin, The Institution of Christian Religion, tr. Thomas Norton (London: 1561). For a look at Norton's career in Parliament see M.A.R. Graves, "Thomas Norton The Parliament Man: An Elizabethan M.P., 1559-1581", Historical Journal, vol. 23, no. 1, 1980, pp. 17-35.
62. Calvin, Institution, f. 170v. Calvin had earlier mentioned that deed by Moses applauded by the Geneva Bible where "knowing himselfe appointed by the power of the Lorde to be the deliverer of hys people, he layed hys handes upon the Egyptian." Ibid., f. 163v.
63. Ibid., f. 170v.
64. Ibid., f. 171. Cf. Allen, A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century, pp. 57-58, and Skinner, Foundations, vol. II, p. 220.
65. John Calvin, Commentaries upon the Prophet Daniell, tr. Arthur Golding (London: 1570), f. 112.
66. Edmund Bunny, ed., The Institutions of Christian Religion, tr. Edward May (London: 1580); William Lawne, ed., An Abridgement of the Institution of

Christian Religion, tr. Christopher Fetherstone (Edinburgh: 1585).

67. Bunny, ed., The Institutions, ff. 270-270v.

68. John Calvin, A Harmonie Upon the Three Evangelists, tr. "E.P." (London: 1584), pp. 713-14.

69. John Calvin, The Commentaries of M. John Calvine upon the Actes of the Apostles, tr. Christopher Fetherstone (London: 1585), pp. 412-13.

70. John Calvin, The Sermons of M. John Calvin Upon the Fifth Booke Of Moses called Deuteronomie, tr. Arthur Golding (London: 1583), pp. 645, 648-9 and 635-36. The similarity of these sentiments to those of Knox and Goodman may be explained by the fact that this particular sermon of Calvin's was delivered in November 1555 when the English colony at Geneva had just been swelled by arrivals from the troubled Frankfort church.

71. Pierre Viret, A Christian Instruction, tr. John Shute (London: 1573), pp. 518-19.

72. Bullinger, Fiftie Godlie And Learned Sermons, pp. 174-5.

73. Peter Martyr, Most fruitfull and learned Commentaries of Doctor Peter Martyr Vermil (tr. John Day?), (London: 1564). It is interesting to note that Martyr was sent twenty crowns for this book by the Bishop of Ely, Richard Cox, who had been an exile at Strasbourg. Hastings Robinson, ed., Zurich Letters (Cambridge: 1842), p. 112.

74. Martyr, Commentaries, f. 56.

75. Ibid., f. 91. This is highly reminscent of Ponet's

Shorte Treatise, which also refers to Polydore Vergil and examples of resistance in Rome and Denmark.

76. Martyr, Commentaries, ff. 165v and 85.

77. Peter Martyr, Most learned and fruitfull Commentaries...upon the Epistle of S. Paul to the Romanes, tr. H.B. Barton? (London: 1568). In the dedication to Marian exile Sir Anthony Cooke, which prefaced both the original and translation, Martyr claims that he had taught the contents of the book to his students during his stay at Edwardian Oxford.

78. Ibid., f. 427v-430.

79. Ibid., f. 430v. It is difficult to see in comparing the Elizabethan translations of Martyr's commentaries on Judges and on Romans, how Skinner's opinion, that the resistance theory in Romans was less equivocal than the mere "passive disobedience" counselled in the work on Judges, can be sustained. Skinner, Foundations, vol. II, pp. 213 and 216.

80. Peter Martyr, The Common Places...of Peter Martyr, tr. Anthony Marten (London: 1583), part 4, pp. 324-25.

81. Ibid., pp. 325-26.

82. Ibid., pp. 326.

83. Ibid., pp. 328-29.

84. Louis de Bourbon, A Declaration made by the Prynce of Conde (London: 1562). The original may have been the work of Theodore Beza, or Francis Hotman. Donald R. Kelley, François Hotman (Princeton: 1973),

p. 158.

85. Louis de Bourbon, A Declaration, Sig. B2v.

86. Francis Hotman, A true and plaine report of the Furious outrages of Fraunce ("Striveling" London : 1573). The title page named the author as "Ernest Varamund of Freseland".

87. Ibid., pp. 142-43.

88. Anon., The fourth parte of Commentaries of the Civill warres in Fraunce (London: 1576). Three previous parts had appeared in 1574.

89. Ibid., p. 126.

90. Ibid., p. 129.

91. Francis Hotman's Francogallia contained this passage in the nineteenth chapter of the original 1573 edition. A critical Latin edition with a parallel English translation has recently been prepared by Ralph E. Giesey and J.H.M. Salmon, Franco-Gallia by François Hotman (Cambridge: 1972).

92. "H.P.", ed., Short Apologie for Christian Souldiours, Sig. A6v.

93. Hubert Languet, A Treatise against the Proclamation published by the King of Spayne ("Delft" [London]: 1584), Sigs. E2-E4v.

94. Ibid., Sigs. H3-H4.

95. George Buchanan, De jure regni apud Scotos (London: 1581). This is the third edition of a work first printed in Edinburgh in 1579 but which had been circulating in manuscript for some time. Though its London publisher was licensed to produce it in both Latin and English, only the Latin version

appeared. Arber, ed., A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640, vol. II, f. 174 b. All citations here are from that translation by Charles Flinn Arrowood, The Powers of the Crown in Scotland (Austin: 1949).

96. Ibid., pp. 107-8.

97. Ibid., pp. 101-7, 142, 146.

98. Skinner, Foundations, vol. II, p. 341.

99. William Dinsmore Briggs, "Sidney's Political Ideas", Studies in Philology, vol. 29, 1932, pp. 534-542 and pp. 539-40.

100. This did not stop copies of the work from circulating, as both Richard Bancroft and Thomas Cartwright gave evidence in 1591 of having read the work. John Strype, The Life and Acts of the Right Reverend Father in God, John Aylmer (Oxford: 1821), p. 211.

101. John Knox, History of the Reformation in Scotland (London: 1587), p. 343.

102. Ibid., pp. 372-74.

103. Ibid., p. 145.

104. The books which escaped the seizure contained only pages 17 to 560. Meant for inclusion was even more resistance material including Knox's spirited defence of his Blast and the 1564 debate on obedience between Knox and Maitland of Lethington.

105. John Jewel, An Answer to a Certain Book...by M. Harding in John Ayre, ed., The Works of John Jewel (Cambridge: 1848), vol. III, p. 171.

106. Ibid., p. 172.

107. John Bridges, The Supremacie of Christian Princes (London: 1573), p. 1034.

108. Ibid., p. 1106.

109. Thomas Bilson, The True Difference Betweene Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion (London: 1585), is really an answer to Cardinal William Allen's attacks on the English treatment of Catholics. Philander's words are often drawn directly from exile Catholic tracts. The work was reprinted in 1586 and 1595.

110. Ibid., p. 520.

111. Ibid., pp. 329-30.

112. Ibid., p. 333.

113. Johann Sleidan, A Famouse Cronicle of our time, called Sleidanes Commentaries, concerning the state of Religion and commonwealth, during the raigne of the Emperour Charles the fift, tr. John Daus (London: 1560). Sleidan, who associated at Strasbourg with the English Marian exiles, published the Latin original in 1555.

114. Ibid., f. 111v.

115. Ibid., ff. 344v-345v.

116. Ibid., f. 263.

117. Raphael Holinshed, The Third volume of Chronicles (London: 1586), p. 2.

118. Ibid., pp. 502-4.

119. Ibid., p. 759.

120. Ibid., pp. 1095-1128.

121. John Hayward, The First Part of The Life And raigne

of King Henrie the IV (London: 1599). The work was reprinted three times, with false imprints, during the reigns of James I and Charles I.

122. Ibid., pp. 66-67.

123. Ibid., pp. 101-2. The Bishop of Carlisle was speaking against Richard's deposition and trying to mitigate the articles enumerating the king's misdeeds.

124. Baldessar Castiglione, The Courtyer, tr. Thomas Hoby (London: 1561). Hoby was a Marian exile who spent his time in northern Italy before returning to England. In the printer's preface to The Courtyer it was stated that the translation had been ready for some time "but that there were certain places in it which of late yeares being misliked of some, that had the perusing of it", the author held it back from publication rather than put forth an abridged version.

125. Ibid., Sig. Pp4v.

126. Ibid., Sig. Rr1v.

127. Lipsius, Six Bookes of Politickes, p. 100. Marginal notes for this passage cite Cicero and Seneca.

128. Jacques Hurault, Politicke, Moral, and Martial Discourses, tr. Arthur Golding (London: 1595), pp. 23-24.

129. A Treatise Paraenetical, that is to say: an exhortation, wherein is showed the way to resist the Castilian king. By a Pilgrim Spaniard, tr. "W.P."

(London: 1598). A French edition from which the English translation was prepared, appeared in London in the same year entitled Traicte paraenetique. It is interesting to note that the work reappeared in 1625 when war with Spain was again on the public mind.

130. A Treatise Paraenetical, p. 57.

131. Anthony Gilby, A Pleasant Dialogue Betweene a Souldior of Berwicke, and an English Chaplaine (Middleburgh: 1581), Sig. E2.

132. Ibid., Sig. E2v.

133. Ibid., Sig. E3.

134. John Stubbs, The Discoverie Of A Gaping Gulf Whereinto England Is Like To Be Swallowed (London: 1579). The printer of this work was Hugh Singleton who had produced many of the Marian exile tracts.

135. Ibid., Sigs. A2 and B8v.

136. Ibid., Sigs. A7, B, and F2v-3.

137. Ibid., Sig. F4.

138. John Penry, An exhortation unto the governours,and people of hir Majesties countrie of Wales (London: 1588). The printer of the work was Robert Waldegrave, notorious for his involvement in the Marprelate tracts.

139. Ibid., p. 16.

140. Ibid., p. 40.

141. Laurence Humphrey, A View of the Romish Hydra and Monster, Traison Against the Lords Annointed (Oxford: 1588).

142. Robert Browne, An Answere to Master Cartwright in Albert Peel and Leland H. Carson ed., The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne (London: 1953), 479.

143. Hastings, An Apologie or Defence of the Watch-word, p. 97.

144. Collinson, The Elizabethan Puritan Movement, p. 254.

145. Dudley Fenner, Sacra Theologica, sive Veritas quae est secundam pietatem Ad unicae et verae methodi leges descripta (London: 1586). Quotations here are from a contemporary manuscript translation, British Museum Harley Ms. 6879. I owe my awareness of the importance of this work to Elizabethan resistance theory to Professor Patrick Collinson.

146. Ibid., f. 77.

147. Ibid., f. 88. The Scriptural proof of this argument was cited as Jael's assassination of Sisera in the Book of Judges. In the printed Latin version the discussion of tyranny and its remedies isfound at ff. 80v-81v.

148. B.M. Harley Ms. 6879, f. 88. The Scriptural proof was II Kings 11, the murder of Athaliah and the priests of Baal. The view of Athaliah as an oppressor rather than a usurper is a departure from that of the Elizabethan clergymen, who feared that Catholics might seize on this point, and a return to that of the Marian exiles.

149. Ibid., f. 88v. The King for his part was not to neglect "the Ephori or Princes, as the Confederates

of the Kingdom, or the Kinges counsellers."

150. Ibid., f. 79.

151. Ibid., f. 89.

152. Such works published in the last thirteen years of Elizabeth's reign include an edition of Calvin's Institutes, a dozen editions of the Geneva Bible, Lipsius' Six Books, Hurault's Politicke Discourse, the Treatise Paraenetical and Hayward's Henry IV.

153. Calderwood, "The Elizabethan Protestant Press", p. 323. Foreign reformers' works in translation had predominated early in the reign partly because of the scarcity of English theological writings. As native Protestants began to enter the field imported works were no longer necessary and declined in number.

154. Collinson, The Elizabethan Puritan Movement, pp. 385-388.

155. Public Record Office, S.P. 12/199/1, f. 4v.

156. Richard Bancroft, A Sermon Preached At Paules Crosse (London: 1589), pp. 67-87.

157. Ibid., p. 87.

158. Collinson, The Elizabethan Puritan Movement, p. 424.

159. Richard Bancroft, Daungerous Positions and Proceedings (London: 1593), A Survay of the Pretended Holy Discipline (London: 1593), and Richard Cosin, Conspiracie for Pretended Reformation (London: 1592), passim.

160. Among the books written by Genevans, Bancroft listed

one entitled The booke of Obedience, compiled, he claimed, "by three or foure whose names I know not". A Sermon, p. 79. The book was, in fact, Bishop Ponet's Shorte Treatise, two heavily annotated copies of which Bancroft had in his library. Bancroft's disguising of the title, the known authorship of the book after the exile in Puritan circles, and Bancroft's once-only marginal ascription (Dangerous Positions, p. 142) of the book to "I.P." -- not "D.I.P.B.R.W." as on the title page -- leads one to believe that Bancroft knew the author of this deliciously seditious book to be, not a Genevan presbyterian, but an English bishop.

161. In his eagerness to convict his Puritan adversaries Bancroft really emphasizes the scarcity of resistance theory advanced by Elizabethan presbyterian writers. His heavy dependance on Marian and Huguenot writers is underscored by the feebleness of the case he is able to bring against such advocates of non-violence as John Penry and the authors of the Admonition to Parliament. Dangerous Positions, pp. 50 and 135-36.

162. Thomas Cartwright was forced to play down his role in the production of Fenner's Sacra Theologica for which Cosin had attacked him in Conspiracie for Pretended Reformation, p. 101. Cartwright denied that Fenner's view of ephoral power was the seditious one which church officials ascribed to

the book but, he claimed, even if it were, his introduction to the work did not make him responsible for its contents. Cartwright also admitted having read Knox's History but claimed not to remember the seditious passages which Bancroft, examining him before the High Commission in 1591, pointed out. A.F. Scott Pearson, Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1535-1603 (Cambridge: 1925), pp. 334-35 and 462-63.

163. This potential use for resistance theory would explain the stands of Hastings and Browne against usurpers, and the defence, in the troubled 1580's, of the rights of the inferior magistracy by Humphrey and Fenner.

CONCLUSION

England, despite its mid-Tudor epidemic of rebellions, was late developing mature theories of resistance. Continental Protestants, faced with a different set of problems than their English co-religionists, were sanctioning violence in defence of religion at a time when resistance theory in England was only in imported or embryonic form.

The challenge to English Protestantism posed by the Marian regime rapidly called forth doctrines of justifiable resistance, enunciated by exile leaders. Several of these doctrines were well in advance of anything that European reformers had produced. Where European Protestants had been careful to restrict resistance to defence of the true religion, England was urged to withstand tyranny for secular reasons as well. Threats to Englishmen's lives, families, property, offices, customs, statutes and general well-being were used as examples of tyrannical behaviour and legitimate excuses for resistance. The crimes of Mary and Philip often seemed to resemble those perpetrated by earlier English tyrants, as reported in the nation's chronicles. Where Continental Calvinists and Lutherans had focussed their interest on the inferior magistracy as the proper agency for opposition to the tyrant, Marian exiles looked to individual assassins and popular rebellion, as well as a more broadly-defined inferior magistrate,

for national deliverance. For reasons constitutional, religious, or of self-defence, Englishmen, collectively or individually, were permitted to resist.

While resistance theory, in all its various Marian forms, saw publication in the reign of Elizabeth, nothing new was added and its application was expected, in the main, to be foreign. During these years, however, the theories of English and Continental Catholics, and of Scottish and French Protestants overtook all but the most radical of Marian exile thought .English Catholics, led by Nicholas Sanders, Cardinal William Allen, and the Jesuit Robert Persons, wrote defending the papal power to depose princes, tyranncide, and popular rebellion.[1] In France publicists of the Catholic League defended resistance to tyrants by the people,[2] while Huguenots argued the rights of the inferior magistracy and, on occasion, the legitimacy of tyrannicide.[3] In Scotland, George Buchanan wrote, in a very secular tone, a work proposing tyrannicide or a rising of the whole people as proper responses to oppression.

At least some of this radical impulse can be traced to the writings of English Protestants. For example, the influence of Ponet's Shorte Treatise on the Huguenot Vindiciae and Buchanan's De jure regni is apparent. The very structure of Vindiciae, a division of the work in answer to several questions, bears the stamp of the Shorte Treatise as do the shared questions of whether subjects must obey princes against God and whether the subjects' goods belong

to the King. Both believe rulers are instituted by the people, and fear contemporary rulers with absolutist pretensions. Both deny a king ownership of his subjects' goods and there are shared examples of resistance. Both believe princes should liberate oppressed neighbours from tyranny and both approve of tyrannicide.[4] Ponet's influence on Buchanan's work is even more pronounced as the authors agree on papal and royal deposition, and on popular sovereignty. Both use the same examples.[5]

The effect of English Protestant writings on the resistance theory of Elizabethan Catholics requires a great deal more study but such an investigation might begin with Catholic use of English chronicles for instances of just deposition[6] and the influence of Ponet's Shorte Treatise on Person's Conference.[7]

The great day of English resistance theory was yet to come. The revolutionary struggles of the seventeenth century produced an enormous output of writing advocating all manner of resistance and the doctrines pronounced against Tudor tyranny found ample employment in the wars against the Stuarts. Tyrannicide, popular sovereignty, the rights of the inferior magistracy, and the distinction between treason to the realm and to the king were powerful themes in seventeenth-century England and Scotland. John Milton cited the works of Goodman, Knox, Fenner, and Ponet among the foundations of resistance theory and called the Marian exile authors "the true Protestant Divines of England, our Fathers in the faith we hold."[8]

CONCLUSION: NOTES

1. The best introduction to this literature is Thomas Clancy, Papist Pamphleteers (Chicago: 1964). Unlike their Portestant predecessors in exile the Catholics appeared to have restricted the writings of resistance tracts to a few hands.
2. Frederic J. Baumgartner, Radical Reactionaries: the political thought of the French Catholic League (Geneva: 1976) is the best work in English on the subject. One of the most radical of the Leagues writers, resembling Ponet and Buchanan in his appeal to the people and belief in tyrannicide, was the English Catholic priest William Reynolds, author of De Iusta Reipublicae.
3. A good introduction to Huguenot political theory is Julian H. Franklin, Constitutionalism and Resistance in the Sixteenth Century (New York: 1969). Two of the more important French Protestant treatises are in English translation. Harold J. Laski, ed., A Defense of Liberty Against Tyrants (Gloucester, Mass: 1963), is a reprint of a 1689 translation of Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos. Giesey and Salmon in Francogallia, present Latin and English versions of François Hotman's work.
4. Compare Vindiciae, pp. 65,70,111-12, 118, 124-25, 141,158, 190,204, and 215 with the Shorte Treatise, Sigs. D3, D6 and B3; D2; D2v-D3; A5; G5 and D7; F8v; and G3-3v.

5. See Arrowood's introduction to his translation of Buchanan's De jure regni, The Powers of the Crown in Scotland, pp. 28-31, for points of contact between Ponet and Buchanan.
6. Robert Persons Conference About the Next Succession (Antwerp: 1595), pp. 55-62 and his Elizabethae... saevissimum in catholicos edictum (Antwerp: 1592), p. 245 are striking examples of Catholic use of Elizabethan chronicles.
7. Since Ponet and Persons share conciliarist roots to their thought it is possible that Persons might not have read Ponet's work but compare the Conference on the origins of government (pp. 3-10), the permissibility of resistance (p. 32), delegated power (p. 73) and Trajan (p. 79) with similar topics in the Shorte Treatise.
8. John Milton, Tenure of Kings and Magistrates in The Works of John Milton, ed., Frank Allen Patterson (New York: 1932) vol. IV, pp. 49-52. Milton incorrectly attributes Ponet's work to Anthony Gilby. Ponet's Shorte Treatise, Knox's History, Hayward's Henrie IV, and the Geneva Bible, were among Tudor writings on resistance reissued under the first two Stuarts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Sources

British Museum - Harley Mss. - 180; 424; 6879
- Additional Mss. - 24,562; 29,546; 32,091

Dr. Williams's Library - Morrice Collection "C"

Public Record Office - S.P. 12, 199/1

Primary Sources

"de Adamo, Anthoni", An Anatomi...of the Mass, Strasbourg: Kopfel, 1556. STC 17200

von Amsdorf, Nicholas, Bekenntnis Unterricht und vermanung, Magdeburg: M. Lotther, 1550

Anon., A breviat Cronicle, Canterbury: J. Mychell, 1552. STC 9969

Anon. (John Hales?), Certayne Questions Demaunded and asked by the Noble Realme of Englande, Wesel?: H. Singleton?, 1555. STC 9981

Anon., Certayne Sermons, or Homelies, London: R. Grafton, 1547. STC 13640

Anon., The Communication betwene my Lord Chauncelor and judge Hales, London?: John Day?, 1553. STC 11583

Anon., A Copye of a verye fyne and wytty letter, Emden; and London?: E. Van Der Erve;and J. Kingston and H. Sutton for J. Wayland?, 1556. STC 15693 and 15693.5

Anon., A Dialogue or Familiar talke betwene two neighbours, (London?: John Day?, 1554. STC 10383

Anon.(John Knox?), The Doctrine of the Masse booke, London?: John Day?, 1554. STC 7059

Anon., The fourth parte of the Commentaries of the Civill warres in France, London: H. Bynneman for H. Toy, 1576

Anon., An Homilie agaynst disobedience and wyllful rebellion, London: R. Jugge and J. Cawood, 1571. STC 13679

Anon., The Humble and unfained confession of the belefe of certain poore banished men, London?: John Day?, 1554. STC 5630

Anon., The Institution of a Christen Man, London: Thomas Berthelet, 1537. STC 5163

Anon., The Lamentacion of England, n.p.: 1557. STC 10014

Anon., The Lamentacion of England, With an addycion off Callis, n.p.: 1558. STC 10015.5

Anon., A letter sent from a banished Minister, London?: John Day?, 1554. STC 10016

Anon., A Treatise Paraenetical, tr. "W.P.", London: W. Ponsonby, 1598. STC 19838

Anon., Traicte paraenetique, tr. J. Montlyard, London: Eliot's Court Press?, 1598, STC 19837.5

Anon., A trewe mirrour or Glase, Wesel?: H. Singleton, 1556. STC 17200

Anon., A Warnyng for Englande, Emden: Van Der Erve, 1555. STC 10024

Aquinas, Thomas, Aquinas: Selected Political Writings, ed. A.P. D'Entreves, tr. J.G. Dawson, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965

Aquinas, Thomas, On the Governance of Rulers, tr. Gerald B. Phelan, Toronto: St. Michael's College, 1935

Aquinas, Thomas, The "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas, Part II (Second Part), tr. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, vol. X, London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1929

Arber, Edward, ed., A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort, London: privately printed, 1908

Arber, Edward, ed., A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London 1554-1640, 5 vols., Birmingham: privately printed, 1894

Aristotle, The Politics of Aristotle, tr. and ed. Ernest Barker, New York: Oxford University Press, 1962

Augustine of Hippo, Two bokes of the noble doctor and B.S. Augustine, tr. John Scory, Emden: Van Der Erve, 1556. STC 921

Aylmer, John, An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjects, London: John Day, 1559. STC 1005

Bale, John, An Admonishion to the Bishoppes, London?: John Day?, 1553. STC 11593

Bale, John, A commyssion sent to the bloudy butcher byshop of London, n.p.: n.d. STC 3286

Bale, John, A declaration of Edmonde Bonners articles, London: J. Tysdall for F. Coldocke, 1561. STC 1289

Bale, John, An Excellent And A right learned meditacion, London?: John Day?, 1554. STC 17773 (formerly 1293)

Bale, John, A faythfull admonycion of a certen trewe pastor, London?, and Strasbourg: John Day?; and Rihel, 1554. STC 16980 and 16981

Bale, John, Scriptorum Illustrium maioris Brytanniae, Basle: Oporinus, 1559

Bale, John, The true hystorie of the Christen departynge of the reverende man, D. Martyne Luther. Wesel: D. van der Straten, 1546. STC 14717

Bale, John, The vocacyon of Johan Bale, Wesel: J. Lamprecht and H. Singleton?, 1553. STC 1307

Bancroft, Richard, Daungerous Positions & Proceedings, London: John Wolfe, 1593. STC 1344

Bancroft, Richard, A Sermon Preached At Paules Crosse, London: E. Bollifant for Gregory Seton, 1589. STC 1348

Bancroft, Richard, A Survay of the Pretended Holy Discipline, London: John Wolfe, 1593. STC 1352

Bancroft, Richard, Tracts Ascribed to Richard Bancroft, ed. Albert Peel, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953

Beard, Richard, A godly psalme of Marye Queene, London: W. Griffith, 1553. STC 1655

Becon, Thomas, An answer to a certain godly mannes lettres, Strasbourg: Rihel, 1557. STC 658

Becon, Thomas, The Catechism of Thomas Becon, ed. John Ayre, Cambridge: Parker Society, 1844

Becon, Thomas, A Confortable Epistle too Goddes faythfull people, Wesel?: Lamprecht?, 1554. STC 1716

Becon, Thomas, A confutacion of that Popishe & Antichristian doctryne, Wesel?: H. Singleton?, 1955 STC 17821

Becon, Thomas, An humble supplicacion unto God, Wesel?: Lamprecht?, 1554. STC 1730

Becon, Thomas, A plaine subversyon, Wesel?: H. Singleton?, 1555. STC 17822

Berry, Lloyd E., The Geneva Bible, a facsimile, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969

Beza, Theodore, De Haereticis a Civili Magistratu puniendis, Geneva: Estienne, 1554

Bible, The Bible & Holy Scriptures, Geneva: Rowland Hall, 1560. STC 2093

Bible, The Holi Bible, London: Richard Jugge, 1568. STC 2099

Bible, The Newe Testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ, Geneva: Badius, 1557. STC 2871

Bilson, Thomas, The True Difference Betweene Christian Subjection & Unchristian Rebellion, Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1585. STC 3071

Bourbon, Louis de, A Declaration made by the Prynce of Conde, London: R. Hall for E. Sutton, 1562. STC 16849

Bradford, John, The Copye of a letter, Antwerp: Dunnill? 1556. STC 3504.5 (formerly 3480)

Bridges, Richard, The Supremacie of Christian Princes, London: Henry Bynneman for Humphrey Toye, 1573. STC 337

Brinklow, Henry, Henry Brinklow's Complaynt of Roderyck Mors, ed. J. Meadows Cowper, London: Early English Text Society, 1874

Browne, Robert, The Writings of Robert Harrison & Robert Browne, ed. Albert Peel & Leland H. Carson, London: Sir Halley Stewart Trust, 1953

Bucer, Martin, The mynd & exposition of that excellente learned man Martyn Bucer, Emden: Van Der Erve, 1566. STC 3964

Bucer, Martin, A treatise, How By the Worde of God, Christian mens Almose ought to Be distributed, tr. attr. John Ponet, n.p.: 1557. STC 3965

Buchanan, George, De jure regni apud Scotos, London: Edward Aggas, 1581. STC 3975

Buchanan, John, The Powers of the Crown in Scotland, tr. Charles Flinn Arrowood, Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1949

Bullinger, Heinrich, Fiftie Godlie And Learned Sermons, divided into five Decades, tr. "H. I.", London: Ralph Newberrie, 1577. STC 4056

Calvin, Jean, An Abridgement Of The Institution of Christian Religion, ed. William Lawne, Edinburgh: Thomas Vautrollier, 1585. STC 4429

Calvin, Jean, The Catechisme, tr. William Whittingham, Geneva: Crespin, 1556. STC 4380

Calvin, Jean, Certain homilies...with an Apologie of Robert Horn, Wesel?: Lamprecht & Singleton?, 1553. STC 4392

Calvin, Jean, The Commentaries...upon the Acts of the Apostles, tr. Christopher Fetherstone, London: George Bishop, 1585. STC 4398

Calvin, Jean, Commentaries...upon the Prophet Daniell, tr. "A.G.", London: John Day, 1570. STC 4397

Calvin, Jean, A Harmonie Upon the Three Evangelists, tr. "E.P.", London: George Bishop, 1584. STC 2962

Calvin, Jean, Institutes of the Christian Religion, ed. John T. McNeill, 2 vols. London: SCM Press, 1960

Calvin, Jean, The Institution of Christian Religion, tr. Thomas Norton, London: R. Wolfe & R. Harison, 1561. STC 4415

Calvin, Jean, An Institution of Christian Religion, ed. Edmund Bunnie, London: T. Dawson for W. Norton, 1580

Calvin, Jean, Ioannis Calvine Opera, vol. XVII ed. Baum, Cunitz & Reuss, Brunswick: Schwetschke, 1877

Calvin, Jean, Letters of John Calvin, ed. Jules Bonnet, tr. Marcus Robert Gilchrist, vol. III, Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1858

Calvin, Jean, The Sermons...Upon...Deuteronomie, tr. Arthur Golding, London: Henry Middleton for George Bishop, 1583. STC 4443

Calvin, Jean, Whether Christian faith maye be kepte in secret, London?: John Day?, 1553. STC 4468

Cartwright, Thomas, Cartwrightiana, ed. Albert Peel & Leland H. Carson, London: Sir Halley Stewart Trust, 1951

Cartwright, Thomas, A Seconde admonition to the Parliament, Wandsworth: "J.S." STC 4713

Castiglione, Baldessar, The Courtyer, tr. Thomas Hoby, London: W. Seres, 1561. STC 4778

Cheke, John, The hurt of sedicion, London: John Day, 1549. STC 5109

Cicero, Marcus Tullius, Marcus Tullius Ciceroes thre bookes of duties, London: Richard Tottell, 1556. STC 5281

Cooper, Thomas, ed., An Epitome of Cronicles, London: Thomas Berthelet, 1549. STC 15217

Cosin, Richard, Conspiracie for Pretended Reformation, London: Deputies of Christopher Barker, 1592. STC 5823

Coverdale, Miles, An exhortacion to the carriengeof of Chrystes crosse, Wesel?: H. Singleton?, 1555. STC 5890

Cranmer, Thomas, A Confutacion of unwritten verities, ed. "E.P." Wesel?: J. Lamprecht?, 1556? STC 5996

Cranmer, Thomas, The copy of certain lettres sent to the Quene, Emden: E. Van Der Erve, 1556. STC 5999

Cranmer, Thomas, Defensio verae et catholicae doctrinae, tr. John Cheke?, Emden: E. Van Der Erve, 1557. STC 6004

Cranmer, Thomas, Miscellaneous Writings & Letters, ed. John Edmund Cox, Cambridge: Parker Soc., 1846

Crowley, Robert, An answere For The Tyme, Emden: Van Der Erve, 1566. STC 10388

Crowley, Robert, A briefe discourse against the outwarde apparell, Emden?: Van Der Erve? 1566. STC 6078

Crowley, Robert, An information & Peticion agaynst the oppressours of the pore Commons, London: John Day, 1548. STC 6086

Crowley, Robert, The way to wealth, London: R. Crowley, 1551. STC 6096

Cyprian, Saint, Certein workers of blessed Cipriane, tr. John Scory, Emden: Van Der Erve, 1556. STC 6152

Donaldson, Peter S., ed., A Macchiavellian Treatise by Stephen Gardiner, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975

Dorman, Thomas, A Proufe of Certayne Articles In Religion, Antwerp: John Latius, 1564. STC 7062

Dudley, Jane, An Epistle of the Lady Jane, London?: John Day?, 1554

Dudley, Jane, Here in this booke ye have a godly Epistle, n.p.: Anthony Scoloker?, 1554. STC 5153

Dudley, John, The saying of John late Duke of Northumberlande uppon the scaffolde, London: J. Cawood, 1553. STC 7283

Elder, John, The copie of a letter sent in to Scotlande London: J. Waylande, 1554. STC 7552

Elyot, Thomas, The Image of Governance, London: Thomas Berthelet, 1541. STC 7664

Fabyan, Robert, The Chronicle of Fabyan, London: W. Bonham, 1542. STC 10661

Fenner, Dudley, Sacra Theologica, London: "Eustace Vignon", 1586

Foxe, John, Acts and Monuments, ed. Stephen Reed Cattley, 8 vols., London: Seeley & Burnside, 1837-39

Foxe, John, Ad inclytos ac praepotentes Angliae Proceres, Ordines et Status, Totamque eius gentis Nobilitatem, pro afflictis fratribus Supplicatio, Basle: Oporinus, 1557

Foxe, John, Christus Triumphans, Basle: Oporinus, 1556

Foxe, John, Commentarii rerum in ecclesia gestarum, Strasbourg: Ribel, 1554

Foxe, John, Two Latin Comedies, ed. John Hazel Smith, Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1973

Frarin, Peter, Oratio Petri Frarini, Louvain: J. Fowler, 1566

Frarin, Peter, An Oration Against the Unlawfull Insurrections of the Protestantes, tr. John Fowler, Antwerp: J. Fowler, 1566. STC 11333

Fulke, William, An Apologie of the Professors of the Gospel in Fraunce, Cambridge: T. Thomas, 1586

Furnivall, Frederick, ed., Ballads from Manuscripts, vol. I, London: Ballad Society, 1867

Gardiner, Stephen, De Vera Obedentia: An Oration, tr. John Olde or John Bale?, London?: John Day?, 1553. STC 11585

Gilby, Anthony, A Pleasant Dialogue Betweene a Souldiour of Berwicke, & an English Chaplaine, Middleburgh?: R. Schilders, 1581. STC 11888

Gilby, Anthony, To my lovyne brethren, Endem?: Van Der Erve?, 1566. STC 10389

Gilby, Anthony, A treatice of election & reprobation, London: Moptid & Mather, 1575?, STC 11885

Goodman, Christopher, How Superior Powers Oght to Be Obeyd, Geneva: Crespin, 1558. STC 12020

Gorham, George, ed., Gleanings of A Few Scattered Ears, London: Bell & Daldy, 1857

Great Britain. Historical Manuscripts Commission. Report on the Manuscripts of Allan George Finch Esq., vol. I, London: HMSO 1913

Great Britain. House of Commons. Journals of the House of Commons 1547-1607, London: n.p., 1803

Great Britain. House of Lords. Journals of the House of Lords, vol. I, London: n.p., n.d.

Great Britain, Public Record Office. Acts of the Privy Council 1554-56 and 1556-58 ed. John Roche Dasent, London: HMSO, 1892-93

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of Patents, Philip & Mary vol. III, London: HMSO, 1938?

Great Britain, Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers Domestic, Mary, ed. Robert Lemon, London: HMSO, 1856

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Edward VI, ed. William Turnbull, London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1861

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, Mary I, ed. William Turnbull, London: HMSO, 1861

Great Britain, Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Spanish vols. XI-XIII, ed. Royall Tyler, London: HMSO, 1916-1954

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, 1555-56, vol. VI (1), ed. Rawdon Brown, London: Longmans, 1877.

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Letters & Papers, Foreign & Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII, vol. XII (1), ed. James Goirdner, London: HMSO, 1890

Grindal, Edmund, The Remains of Edmund Grindal, ed. William Nicholson, Cambridge: Parker Soc., 1843

Gualter, Rudolph, Antichrist, tr. John Olde. Emden: Van Der Erve, 1556. STC 25009

Hales, John, "A Declaration of the Succession of the Crowne Imperiall of Ingland," in George Harbin, ed. The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted, London: Richard Smith, 1713

Halle, Edward, The Union of the two noble & illustrate famelies of Lancastre & Yorke, London: E. Halle, 1548. STC 12721

Hastings, Francis, An Apologie or Defence of the Watch-word, London: F. Kingston for R. Jackson, 1600. STC 12928

Hastings, Francis, A Watch-Word to All religious & true hearted English-men, London: F. Kingston for R. Jackson, 1598. STC 12927

Hayward, John, The First Part of the Life & raign of Kinge Henrie the IIII, London: John Wolfe, 1599. STC 12995

Heywood, John, The trayterous taykinge of Scarborow Castell, London: John Heywood, 1557

"Hilarie, Hughe", (John Bale?) The resurreccion of the masse. London? or Wesel?: H. Singleton? or J. Lamprecht? 1554. STC 13457

Holinshed, Raphael. The Third volume of Chronicles London: Harison et al., 1586. STC 13569

Hooper, John, Early Writings of Bishop Hooper, ed. Samuel Carr, Cambridge: Parker Soc., 1843

Hooper, John, Godly & most necessary annotations in the xiii chapter to the Romaynes, Worcester: J. Oswen, 1551. STC 13756

Hooper, John. A Soveraigne Cordial For a Christian Conscience, London?: John Day?, 1554. STC 5157

Howell, T. B., ed. A Complete Collection of State Trials, vol. I, London: T. C. Hansard, 1816

Hotman, Francis, A True & plaine report of the Furious outrages of Fraunce, London?: n.p., 1573. STC 13847

Huggarde, Miles, The displaying of the Protestantes, London: R. Caly, 1556. STC 13557

Hughes, Paul F. & James F. Larkin, Tudor Royal Proclamations, vol II, New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1969

Humphrey, Laurence, De religionis conservatione et reformatione vera, Basle: n.p. 1559

Humphrey, Laurence, The Nobles or of the Nobilitye, London: T. Marshe, 1563. STC 13964

Humphrey, Laurence, Optimates, Basle: n.p., 1560

Humphrey, Laurence, A View of the Romish Hydra, Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1588. STC 13966

Hurault, Jacques, Politicke, Moral & Martial Discourses, tr. Arthur Golding, London: A. Islip, 1595. STC 14000

Janelle, Pierre, Obedience in Church & State, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1930

Jewel, John, A Defence of the Apology of the Church of England, The Works of John Jewel, ed. John Ayre, vol. III, Cambridge: Parker Soc., 1848

John of Salisbury, Frivolities of Courtiers & Footprints of Philosophers, ed. Joseph B. Pike, Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1938

John of Salisbury, The Statesman's Book of John of Salisbury, ed. John Dickinson, New York: Alfred Knopf, 1927

Kethe, William, Of misrules contending, with gods worde by name, London: 1549. STC 14941

Kethe, William, W. Keth: His Seeing Glasse, n.p.: 1555. STC 14944

Knox, John, An Admonition or warning, London?: John Day?, 1554. STC 15059

Knox, John, An Answer to...an Anabaptist, Geneva: Crespin, 1560. STC 15060

Knox, John, The Appellation of John Knox, Geneva: Poullain & Rebul, 1558. STC 15063

Knox, John, The Copie of a Lettre Delivered to the ladie Marie...and nowe augmented, Geneva: Poullain & Rebul, 1558. STC 15067

Knox, John, The Copie of a letter sent to the ladye Mary Wesel?: H. Singleton?, 1556. STC 15066

Knox, John, The copie of an epistle sent unto the inhabitants of Newcastle, & Barwicke, Geneva: n.p., 1559. STC 15064

Knox, John, A Faythfull admonition...unto the professours of Gods truthe in England, Emden: Van Der Erve, 1554. STC 15069

Knox, John, The First Blast of the Trumpet, Geneva: Poullain & Rebul, 1558. STC 15070

Knox, John, A godly letter sent too the fayethfull,: Wesel?: J. Lamprecht? and H. Singleton?, 1554:. STC 15059.5 (formerly 15073)

Knox, John, The History of the Reformation in Scotland, London: T. Vautrollier, 1587. STC 15071

Knox, John, John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland, ed. William Croft Dickinson, 2 vols. London: Thomas Nelson, 1947

Knox, John, A Percel of the VI Psalme, London?: John Day?, 1554. STC 15074.4

Knox, John, The Works of John Knox, ed. David Laing, 6 vols. Edinburgh: Woodrow Society 1846-95

Languet, Hubert, A Treatise against the Proclamation...by the King of Spayne, London: T. Marshe?, 1584. STC 15209

Languet, Hubert, A Defence of Liberty Against Tyrants, ed. Harold J. Laski, Gloucester, Mass: Peter Smith, 1963

Languet, Hubert, A Short Apologie for Christian Souldiours, tr. "H.P." London: John Wolfe for Henry Carre, 1588. STC 15207

Latimer, Hugh, Sermons of Hugh Latimer, ed. George Elwes Corrie, Cambridge: Parker Soc., 1844

Lever, Thomas, A Sermon made in the Shroudes in Poules, London: John Day, 1550. STC 15543

Lever, Thomas, A Sermon preached the fourth Sundaye in Lente, London: John Day, 1550. STC 15549

Lever, Thomas, A Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse, London: John Day, 1550. STC 15546

Lever, Thomas, A Treatise of the right way from Danger of Sinne, London: H. Bynneman for George Byshop, 1575. STC 15552

Lipsius, Justus, Sixe Bookes Of Politickes, tr. William Jones, London: R. Field for W. Ponsonby, 1594. STC 15701

Luther, Martin, Luther's Works, vol. XLVII, ed. Franklin Sherman, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971

Luther, Martin, Warnung D. Martini Luther an seyne liebe Deutchen...Mit einer Vorrede Philippi Melanthon, Nürmberg: Herman Hamsing, 1546

Lydgate, John, Here begynneth the boke of Johan Bochas, London: Richard Pynson, 1527. STC 3176

Lynne, Gwalter, ed. Carion's Cronicles, London: G. Lynne, 1550. STC 4626

Machyn, Henry, The Diary of Henry Machyn, ed., John Gough Nichols, London: Camden Soc., 1848

Major, John, A History of Greater Britain, ed., Archibald Constable, Edinburgh: Scottish History Soc., 1892

Marsilius of Padua , The defence of peace, tr. William Marshall, London: Robert Wyer, 1535. STC 17817

Marsilius of Padua, The Defensor Pacis, ed. Alan Gewirth, New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1956

Martyr, Peter, Commentaries...upon the Epistle of S. Paul to the Romanes, tr. "H.B.", London: John Day, 1568. STC 24672

Martyr, Peter, The Common Places, tr. Anthony Marten, London: H. Denham, T. Chard, W. Broome & A. Maunsell, 1583. STC 24669

Martyr, Peter, Most fruitfull & learned Commentaries, London: John Day, 1564. STC 24670

Martyr, Peter, A Treatise of the Cobabitacyon of the faithfulll with the unfaithfull, tr. Thomas Becon? Strasbourg: Rihel, 1555. STC 24673.5 (formerly 24246)

Maunsell, Andrew, Catalogue of English printed Bookes, London: J. Windet for A. Maunsell, 1595. STC 17669

Milton, John, The Tenure of Kings & Magistrates The Works of John Milton, ed. Frank Allen Patterson, vol IV, New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1932

Morison, Richard, An Exhortation to styrre all Englyshe men to the defence of theyr countreye, London: Thomas Berthelet, 1539. STC 18110

Morison, Richard, An Invective Ayenste....treason, London: Thomas Berthelet, 1539. STC 18111

Morison, Richard, A Lamentation in whiche Is Shewed what Ruyne & distruction cometh of seditious rebellyon, London: Thomas Berthelet, 1536. STC 18113.3

Morison, Richard, A Remedy For Sedition, London: Thomas Berthelet, 1536. STC 18113.5

Musculus, Wolfgang, Common places of Christian Religion, tr. John Man, London: Reynolde Wolfe, 1563. STC 18308

Musculus, Wolfgang, Of the lawful & unlawful usurie amongest Christians, tr. "T.L.", Wesel?: H. Singleton?, 1556. STC 18310

Musculus, Wolfgang, The Temporysour, tr. Robert Pownoll Wesel?: H. Singleton?, 1555. STC 18312

Ode, John, The acquital or purgation of...Edwarde the VI. Emden: Van Der Erve, 1555. STC 18797

Olde, John, A confession of the....olde belefe, Emden: Van Der Erve, 1556. STC 18798

Olde, John, A Short description of Antichrist, Emden: Van Der Erve, 1556? STC 673

Parker, Matthew, Correspondence of Matthew Parker, ed. John Bruce, Cambridge: Parker Soc., 1853

Peel, Albert, ed. The Seconde Parte of a Register, 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1915

Penry, John, An exhortation unto the governorous, & people...of Wales, London: R. Waldegrave, 1588. STC 19605

Persons, Robert, A Conference About the Next Succession to the Crowne of Ingland, Antwerp: A Conincx, 1595. STC 19398

Persons, Robert, Elizabethae...saevissimum in Catholicos edictum, Antwerp: A. Coninex, 1592

Philpot, John, Vera expositio disputationis , Cologne: n.p. 1554. STC 19891

Philpot, John, The trew report of the dysputacyon, Emden?: Gheylliaert & Mierdman?, 1554 STC 19890

Pole, Reginald, Pole's Defense of the Unity of the Church, tr. Joseph G. Dwyer, Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1965

Pole, Reginald, The seditious & blasphemous Oration of Cardinal Pole, tr. Fabyan Wythers, London: O. Rogers, 1560. STC 20087

Ponet, John, An Apologie Fully Answeringe...Thomas Martin, Strasbourg: Kopfel 1555 & 1556. STC 20175 & 20175a

Ponet, John, A notable Sermon, London: G. Lynne, 1550. STC 20177

Ponet, John, A Short Catechisme, London: John Day, 1553. STC 4812

Ponet, John, A Shorte Treatise of politicke power.... with an exhortacion, Strasbourg: Kopfel, 1566. STC 20178

Ponet, John, A Short Treatise of Politique Power, Paris?: n.p., 1639, STC 20179

Ponet, John, A Supplicacyon to the quenes majestie, Strasbourg: Rihel, 1555. STC 17562

Pownoll, Robert, An Admonition to the Towne of Callays, Wesel?: de Zuttere?, 1557. STC 19078

Pownoll, Robert, A Moste Pythye & Excellent Epistell, Wesel?: Lamprecht?, 1556, STC. 10432

Proctor, John, The historie of wyates rebellion, London: R. Caly, 1554. STC 20407

Rastell, John, The Pastime of People, London: Rivington et al. 1811

Richards, Shila, ed. Secret Writings in the Public Records, Henry VIII - George III, London: HMSO, 1974

Ridley, Nicholas & Hugh Latimer, Certein godly, learned & comfortable conferences, ed. John Olde, Emden: Van Der Erve, 1556. STC 21047.3

Ridley, Nicholas and Hugh Latimer, Certen godly, learned & comfortable conferences....wherunto is added: A Treatise agaynst the errour of Transubstantiation, ed. William Whittingham, Strasbourg: Ribel, 1556. STC 210478

Ridley, Nicholas, De Coena Dominica assertio, tr. William Whittingham? Geneva: Crespin, 1556

Ridley, Nicholas, The Works of Nicholas Ridley, ed. Henry Christmas, Cambridge: Parker Soc., 1843

Robinson, Hastings, ed. Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation 2 vols. Cambridge: Parker Soc., 1846-47

Robinson, Hastings, The Zurich Letters, 2 vols., Cambridge: Parker Soc., 1842-45

Sampson, Thomas, A letter to the trew professors of Christes Gospell, Wesel?: Lamprecht? STC 21683

Sandys, Edwin, The Sermons of Edwin Sandys, ed. John Ayre, Cambridge: Parker Soc., 1842

Scory, John An Epistle...unto all the faythfull that be in pryson in Englande. Emden: Van Der Erve, 1555. STC 21854

Scott, S. P., ed. Corpus Juris Civilis, the Civil Law, Vols. IX & XV, New York: AMS Press, 1973

Sleidan, Johan, A Famouse Cronicle of our time, tr. John Daus, London: J. Day for A. Veale & Nicholas England, 1560. STC 19848

Stapleton, Thomas, A Counterblast to M. Hornes Vayne Blast, Louvain: J. Fowler, 1567. STC 23231

Starkey, Thomas, A Dialogue Between Reginald Pole & Thomas Lupset, ed. Kathleen M. Burton, London: Chatto & Windus, 1948

Starkey, Thomas, An Exhortation to the people London: Thomas Berthelet, 1536. STC 23236

Stubbs, John, The Discoverie of A Gaping Gulf London: H. Singleton, 1579. STC 23400

Travers, Walter, A full & plaine declaration of Ecclesiasticall Discipline, tr., Thomas Cartwright, Heidelberg: M. Schirat, 1574. STC 24184

"T., J" An apologie...of certayne men, which...have abandoned theyr livinges , Wesel?: H. Singleton?, 1555. STC 23619

Traheron, Bartholomew, An aunswere Made...To A privie Papiste, Wesel: de Zuttere?, 1558. STC 24167.7

Traheron, Bartholomew, An Exposition of a part of S. Johannes Gospel, Wesel: de Zuttere?, 1558. STC 24169

Traheron, Bartholomew, An Exposition of the .4. Chapter of S. Johns Revelation, Wesel: de Zuttere?, 1558. STC 24170

Traheron, Bartholomew, A Warning to England to Repent, Wesel: de Zuttere?, 1558. STC 24174

Turner, William, The Huntyng of the Romyshe Wolfe, Emden: Van Der Erve, 1554. STC 24356

Turner, William, A new booke of spiritual Physik, Emden: Van Der Erve, 1555. STC 24361

Tyndale, William, Doctrinal Treatises, ed. Henry Walter Cambridge: Parker Soc., 1848

Vergil, Polydore, The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil, A.D. 1485-1537, Ed., Denys Hay, London: Royal Historical Soc., 1950

Vergil, Polydore, Polydore Vergil's English History, vol. I, ed. Sir Henry Ellis, London: Camden Soc., 1846

Vergil, Polydore, Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History , ed. Sir Henry Ellis, London: Camden Soc., 1844

Viret, Pierre, A Christian Instruction, tr. John Shute, London: A. Veale, 1573. STC 24778

"W., T." (Thomas Watertoune) A ninvectyve agaynst treason, London: R. Madely, 1553,. STC 25105

Watson, Robert, Aetiologia de transubstantione. Emden: Vam Der Erve, 1556. STC 25111

Werdmueller, Otto, The hope of the faythful, tr. Miles Coverdale, Wesel?: H. Singleton?, 1555. STC 25249

Werdmueller, Otto, A moste frutefull, piththye & learned treatise, tr. Miles Coverdale, Wesel?: H. Singleton, 1555. STC 24219

Werdmueller, Otto , A spiritual & most precious perle, tr. Miles Coverdale, Wesel?: H. Singleton?, 1555. STC 25255

Whittingham, William, ed. The form of prayer & ministration of the sacraments or uses in the English Congregation at Geneva, Geneva: Crespin, 1556. STC 16561

de Worde, Wynkyn, ed. The Cronycles of Englonde, London: W. de Worde, 1528. STC 10002

Wriothesley, Charles, A Chronicle of England During the Reigns of the Tudors, ed. William Douglas Hamilton, vol. II, London: Camden Soc., 1877

Youngs, Frederic A., The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press 1976

Zwingli, Huldreich, The accompt rekenynge & confession tr. Thomas Cottesforde, Emden: Van Der Erve, 1555. STC 26140

Zwingli, Huldreich, Sämtliche Werke, ed., Emil Egli & Georg Finsler, vols. II & III, Leipzig: Nachfolge 1908

Zwingli, Huldreich, Selected Workes, ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson, Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1901

Zwingli, Huldreich, The ymage of bothe pastours, tr. John Veron, London: Thomas Raynold, 1550. STC 26142

Zwingli, Huldreich, Zwingli & Bullinger, ed. G. W. Bromiley, London: SCM Press, 1953

Secondary Sources

Allen, J.W., A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century, London: Methuen, 1928, rpt. 1960

Ames, Joseph and William Herbert, Typographical Antiquities, vol. II, London: T. Payne and Son, 1790

Anderson, Marvin Walter, Peter Martyr -- A Reformer in Exile, Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1975

Anderson, Marvin W., "Royal Idolatry: Peter Martyr and the Reformed Tradition", Archiv für Reformationsgesichte, vol. 69, 1978, pp. 157-200

Baron, Hans, "Calvinist Republicanism and Its Historical Roots", Church History, vol. 8, 1939, pp. 30-42

Barron, Caroline M., "The Tyranny of Richard II", Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol. 41, 1968, pp. 1-18

Baskerville, C.R., "Sir Richard Morison As The Author of Two Anonymous Tracts on Sedition", Library, series 4, vol. 17, 1936-37, pp. 83-87

Bauckham, Richard, Tudor Apocalypse, Appleford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1978

Baumer, Franklin LeVan, "Thomas Starkey and Marsilius of Padua", Politica, vol. 2, 1936, pp. 188-205

Baumgartner, Frederic J., Radical Reactionaries, Geneva: Droz, 1975

Beer, Barrett L., Northumberland, Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1973

Benzing, Josef, Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1963

Bindoff, S.T., Ket's Rebellion, London: Historical Association, 1949

Bonini, Cissie Rafferty, "Lutheran Influences in the Early English Reformation: Richard Morison Re-Examined", Archiv für Reformationsgesichte, vol. 64, 1973, pp. 206-24

Briggs, William Dinsmore, "Political Ideas in Sidney's Arcadia", Studies in Philology, vol. 28, 1931, pp. 137-161

Briggs, William Dinsmore, "Sidney's Political Ideas", Studies in Philology, vol. 29, 1932, pp. 534-542

British Museum, Short Title Catalogue of Books printed in the German-speaking countries, London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1962

Burckhardt, Jacob, The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy, tr. S.G.C. Middlemore, London: George Allen, 1914

Burns, J.H. "The Political Ideas of the Scottish Reformation", Aberdeen University Review, vol. 36, 1956, pp. 251-268

Byron, H.J., "Edmund Spenser's First Printer, Hugh Singleton", Library, series 3, vol. 14, 1933-34, pp. 121-56

Carter, Harry, Books Printed at Emden Before 1560, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963

Christianson, Paul, Reformers and Babylon, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978

Clancy, Thomas, Papist Pamphleteers, Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1964

Collinson, Patrick, Archbishop Grindal, London: Jonathan Cape, 1979

Collinson, Patrick, The Elizabethan Puritan Movement, London: Jonathan Cape, 1967

Craig, Hardin, "The Geneva Bible as a Political Document", Pacific Historical Review, vol. 7, 1938, pp. 40-49

Creaman, Charles David, "The Reception of Calvinist Thought in England", Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. 31, 1949

Danner, Dan G., "Christopher Goodman and the English Protestant Tradition of Civil Disobedience", Sixteenth Century Journal, vol. 8, 1977, pp. 61-74

Davis, W.T. "A Bibliography of John Bale", Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings and Papers, vol. 5, 1936-39, pp. 201-79

Dickens, A.G., The English Reformation, London: Fontana 1964, rpt. 1967

Dixon, Richard Watson, History of the Church of England From the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction, vol. V, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902

Dodds, Madeline Hope and Ruth Dodds, The Pilgrimage of Grace and the Exeter Conspiracy, 2 vols., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915

Eadie, John, The English Bible, 2 vols., London: Macmillan, 1876

Eason, Charles, The Genevan Bible, Dublin: Eason and Son, 1937

Elton, G.R., Policy and Police, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972

Elton, G.R., "Reform and the 'Commonwealth-Men' of Edward VI's Reign", P. Clark, A.G.R. Smith and N. Tyacke, ed., The English Commonwealth 1547-1640, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1979, pp. 23-38

Elton, G.R., "Reform By Statute: Thomas Starkey's Dialogue and Thomas Cromwell's Policy", Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. 54, 1968, pp. 165-88

Elton, G.R., Tudor Constitution, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960

Emerton, Ephraim, Humanism and Tyranny, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1925

Fairfield, Leslie P., John Bale, West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 1976

Fairfield, Leslie P., "The Mysterious Press of 'Michael Wood' (1553-1554)", Library, series 5, vol. 27, 1972, pp. 220-32

Fletcher, Anthony, Tudor Rebellions, London: Longman, 1973

Franklin, Julian H., Constitutionalism and Resistance in the Sixteenth Century, New York: Pegasus, 1969

Frith, Katharine R., The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530-1645, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979

Fuller, The Church History of Britain, vol. IV, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1845

Garrett, Christina, "John Ponet and the Confession of the Banished Ministers", Church Quarterly Review, vol. 137, 1943-44, pp. 47-74 and 181-204

Garrett,Christina, The Marian Exiles, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938

Garrett, Christina, "The Resurreccion of the Masse By Hugh Hilarie...or John Bale (?)", Library, series 4, vol. 21, 1940-41, pp. 143-59

Graves, M.A.R., "Thomas Norton The Parliament Man: An Elizabethan M.P. 1559-1581", Historical Journal, vol. 23, 1980, pp. 17-35

Greaves, Richard L., "John Knox and the Covenant Tradition", Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 24, 1973, pp. 23-32

Greaves, Richard L., "John Knox, the Reformed Tradition and the Development of Resistance Theory",Journal of Modern History, On-Demand Supplement, abstracted, vol. 8, no. 3, Sept. 1976

Greaves, Richard L., "Traditionalism and the Seeds of Revolution in the Social Principles of the Geneva Bible", Sixteenth-Century Journal, vol. 7, 1976, pp. 94-109

Greg, W.W., ed., A Companion to Arber, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967

Hall, Basil, The Genevan Version of the English Bible, London: Presbyterian History Society of England, 1957

Hudson, Winthrop S., John Ponet, Advocate of Limited Monarchy, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942

Isaac, Frank, "Egidius Van Der Erve and His English Printed Books", Library, series 4, vol. 13, 1931-32, pp. 336-64

James, M.E., "Obedience and Dissent in Henrician England: The Lincolnshire Rebellion, 1536", Past&Present, vol. 48, 1970, pp. 3-78

Jaszi, Oscar and John D. Lewis, Against the Tyrant, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957

Johnson, A.F., "English Books Printed Abroad", Library, series 5, vol. 4, 1949-50, pp. 273-76

Johnson, A.F., and V. Scholderer, Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in the Netherlands and Belgium, London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1965

Jones, Whitney R.D., The Tudor Commonwealth 1529-1599, London: Athlone Press, 1970

Jordan, W.K. and M.R. Gleason, "The Saying of John Late Duke of Northumberland upon the Scaffold, 1553", Harvard Library Bulletin, vol. 23, 1975, pp. 139-179 and 324-355

Kelley, Donald R., François Hotman, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973

Knappen, M.M., Tudor Puritanism, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1939

Koenigsberger, H.G., "The Organization of Revolutionary Parties in France and the Netherlands During the Sixteenth Century", Journal of Modern History, vol. 27, 1955, pp. 335-351

Levine, Mortimer, Tudor Dynastic Problems, 1460-1571, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1973

Levy, Fritz, Tudor Historical Thought, San Marino, Calif.: Huntingdon Library, 1967

Linder, Robert Dean, "Pierre Viret and the Sixteenth-Century English Protestants", Archiv fur Reformationsgesichte, vol. 58, 1967, pp. 149-77

Linder, Robert Dean, "Pierre Viret and the Sixteenth-Century French Protestant Revolutionary Tradition", Journal of Modern History, vol. 38, 1960, pp. 125-37

Linder, Robert Dean, The Political Ideas of Pierre Viret, Geneva: Droz, 1964

Little, Paul, "John Knox and English Social Prophecy", Journal of the Presbyterian History Society of England, vol. 14, 1970, pp. 117-27

Loach, Jennifer, "Pamphlets and Politics, 1553-58", Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, vol. 48, 1975, pp. 31-44

Loades, D.M., "The Authorship and Publication of The Copye", Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society, vol. 3, 1960, pp. 155-60

Loades, D.M., "The Enforcement of Reaction", Journal of Ecclesiastical History, vol. 16, 1965, pp. 54-66

Loades, D.M., "The Press Under the early Tudors", Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society, vol. 4, 1964-68, pp. 29-50

Loades, D.M., The Reign of Mary Tudor, London: Ernest Benn, 1979

Loades, D.M., Two Tudor Conspiracies, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965

Lupton, Lewis, A History of the Geneva Bible, 8 vols. London: Fauconberg Press and Olive Tree, 1966 -

Maltby, William, The Black Legend in England, Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1971

Martin, Charles, Les Protestant Anglais réfugiés à Geneve, Geneva: A. Jullien, 1915

Monter, E. William, Calvin's Geneva, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967

Mousnier, Roland, The Assassination of Henry IV, tr. Joan Spencer, London: Faber and Faber, 1973

Mozley, J.F., John Foxe and His Book, London: SPCK, 1940

Nichols, John, The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth, vol. I, London: J. Nichols and Son, 1823

Norwood, Frederick A., "The London Dutch Refugees in Search of a Home, 1553-1554", American Historical Review, vol. 58, 1952, pp. 64-72

Oakley, Francis, "Allmain and Major", American Historical Review, vol. 70, 1964-65, pp. 673-90

Oakley, Francis, "On the Road from Constance to 1688", Journal of British Studies, vol. 1, 1962, pp. 1-31

Oastler, C.L., John Day, the Elizabethan Printer, Oxford: Oxford Bibliographical Society, 1974

Panzer, Katherine et al., Short Title Catalogue I-Z, London: Bibliographical Society, 1976

Parsons, Wilfred, "The Medieval Theory of the Tyrant", The Review of Politics, vol. 4, 1942, pp. 129-43

Pearson, A.F. Scott, Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925

Pollard, A.W. and G.R. Redgrave, Short Title Catalogue 1475-1640, London: Bibliographical Society, 1926

Reid, W. Stanford, "The Divisions of the Marian Exiles", Canadian Journal of History, vol. 3, 1968, pp. 1-26

Reid, W. Stanford, Trumpeter of God, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1974

Ridley, Jasper, John Knox, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968

Rose-Troup, The Western Rebellion of 1549, London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1913

Salmon, J.H.M., The French Wars in English Political Thought, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957

Schenk, W., Reginald Pole, Cardinal of England, London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1950

Schoenberger, Cynthia Grant, "Luther and the Justifiability of Resistance to Legitimate Authority", Journal of the History of Ideas, vol. 40, 1979 pp. 3-20

Skinner, Quentin, The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, vol. II, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978

Smith, Lacey Baldwin, "English Treason Trials and Confessions in the Sixteenth Century", Journal of the History of Ideas, vol. 15, 1954, pp. 471-98

Solt, Leo F., "Revolutionary Calvinist Parties in England Under Elizabeth and Charles I", Church History, vol. 27, 1958, pp. 234-39

Strauss, Leo, ed., On Tyranny, Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1963

Strype, John, Annals of the Reformation, 4 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824

Strype, John, Ecclesiastical Memorials, 3 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822

Strype, John, The Life and Acts of John Aylmer, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821

Strype, John, The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821

Strype, John, The Life of Sir John Cheke, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821

Thompson, W.J.D. Cargill, "Luther and the Right of Resistance to the Emperor", Studies in Church History, vol. 12, 1975, pp. 159-202

Thorp, Malcolm R., "Religion and the Wyatt Rebellion of 1554", Church History, vol. 47, 1948, pp. 363-80

Tierney, Brian, Foundations of the Conciliar Theory, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955

Trimble, William Raleigh, "Early Tudor Historiography, 1484-1548", Journal of the History of Ideas, vol. 11, 1950, pp. 30-41

Walzer, Michael, "Revolutionary Ideology: The Case of the Marian Exiles", American Political Science Review, vol. 57, 1963, pp. 643-54

Walzer, Michael, The Revolution of the Saints, London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1965

Williams, Penry, "Rebellion and Revolution in Early Modern England", M.R.D. Foot, ed., War and Society, New York: Barnes and Nobles, 1973, pp. 225-40

Youngs, Frederic A., "Tudor Governments and Dissident Religious Books", C. Robert Cole and Michael E. Moody, ed., The Dissenting Tradition, Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1975

Zeeveld, Gordon, Foundations of Tudor Policy, London: Methuen, 1948

Unpublished Dissertations

Calderwood, William, "The Elizabethan Protestant Press", University of London, Ph.D., 1977

Dawson, Jane, "The Early Career of Christopher Goodman", University of Durham, Ph.D., 1978

Little, Paul, "The Origins of the Political Ideologies of John Knox and the Marian Exiles", University of Edinburgh, 1972

Took, Patricia, "Government and the Printing Trade, 1540-1560", University of London, Ph.D., 1978